

THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY.

VOL. XIV.

OCTOBER, 1910.

No. 4.

UNIFORMITY OF LITURGY FOR OUR ENGLISH CHURCHES.

The deplorable fact that no uniformity of liturgy for our English services exists in our Synod no one who has given the matter any consideration will deny. Since our Synod has not supplied a satisfactory liturgy for our English services, each congregation with its pastor, in introducing English services, is forced to cast about for some suitable order of service. The consequence is, that most congregations have made a liturgy to meet the requirements of their own good, or bad, liturgical taste. The outcome usually has been an order of service that is as cold and bare, and devoid of churchliness, as if it had been prescribed by unfeeling, iconoclastic Rationalism itself.

Of course, every congregation has the privilege so to do. The order of service is an adiaphoron, and according to the *Formula of Concord* "we believe, teach, and confess that the Church of God of every place and every time has, according to its circumstances, the authority, power, and right (in matters truly adiaphora) to change, to diminish, and to increase them without thoughtlessness and offense, in an orderly and becoming way."¹⁾ Neither should we condemn such congregations as heterodox that have more or less ceremonies than seems good to us. "We believe, teach, and confess also that no Church should condemn another because one has less or more external ceremonies not commanded by God than the other,

1) *Formula of Concord II, ch. X, § 9.*

if otherwise there is agreement among them in doctrine and all its articles, as also in the right use of the holy sacraments, according to the well-known saying: ‘Disagreement in fasting does not destroy agreement in faith.’”²⁾ Luther himself, in supplying the *Deutsche Messe und Ordnung des Gottesdienstes*, 1526, writes: “Above all things do I want all those requested in a very friendly manner, also for God’s sake, who see this order in the services, or care to follow it, that they do not make a necessary law of it, and thereby ensnare or entrap any one’s conscience, but to use it according to their Christian liberty and good pleasure, how, where, when, and as long as the occasion may offer or require it.”³⁾

Nevertheless, where there is unity of faith, there is also a common demand for uniformity in matters external such as “ceremonies, or church rites which are neither commanded nor forbidden in God’s Word, but have been introduced into the Church for the sake of good order and propriety.”⁴⁾ For every congregation to make full use of its Christian liberty by introducing and abiding with the ceremonies and rites of its own fancy, entirely irrespective of the wishes of its sister congregations, would be folly and presumption. Every individual Christian, as well as every Christian congregation, must profess with St. Paul: “All things are lawful unto me, but all things are not expedient.”⁵⁾

Uniformity of liturgy should be striven for by every truly Christian congregation, “that the unity of the Christian people may be affirmed also by such external things which otherwise are not necessary of themselves.”⁶⁾ Experience has shown that differences in rites and ceremonies pander to disruptions, to divisions and offenses also in doctrine. An example are the Christians of “Liefland” (Livonia), to whom Luther writes: “Nevertheless, also this simplicity of doctrine will not remain unassailed by Satan; yea, through the ex-

2) Form. Cone. I, ch. X, § 7.

3) X, 226.

4) Form. Cone. I, ch. X, § 1.

5) 1 Cor. 6, 12.

6) Luther, X, 261.

ternal disagreement of the ceremonies he tries to sneak in, in order to create dissensions in spirit and faith, as is his custom, amply experienced in so many heresies.”⁷⁾ “Although the outward orders of services, as masses, singing, reading, baptizing, do nothing for salvation, yet is that unchristian to be discordant in them and thereby to perplex the poor people, and not much rather regard the bettering of the people than our own will and pleasure. I, therefore, pray you all, my dear sirs, let go of your own mind and get together amicably, and come to an agreement how you want to keep these external things, so that uniformity may exist among you in your district and not dissension with different observances at different places, whereby the people are perplexed and displeased.”⁸⁾ Luther furthermore deplored the sad lack of uniformity in his days, that grievous complaint and offense is caused by the manifold kinds of new masses, and admonishes: “Wherever it happens that people become offended or perplexed by such a manifold usage, we are certainly in duty bound to limit our liberty, and, as much as possible, do all we can that the people might be bettered by us and not offended. Since these external orders are of no consequence to our conscience before God, and yet may be of benefit to our neighbor, we should charitably endeavor, as St. Paul teaches, to be of one mind, and, as well as this can be done, have similar rites and ceremonies, even as all Christians have the same baptism and the same sacrament, and no one has received a special one of God.”⁹⁾ Although our confessions maintain against our opponents that dissimilar rites in themselves do not injure the unity of the Church, yet they declare that “it is pleasing to us that, for the sake of tranquillity (unity and good order), universal rites be observed. Just as also in the churches we willingly observe the order of the mass, the Lord’s day, and other more eminent festival days.”¹⁰⁾ For the sake of good order and propriety, to prevent divisions and offenses, to express the

7) X, 259.

8) X, 260.

9) X, 226.

10) Apology, ch. IV, § 33.

unity of faith, and to make the fellow-Christian stranger within our gates perfectly at home during our services, let us, one and all, honestly strive for, and, peradventure, earnestly recommend more, and, if possible, perfect, uniformity of liturgy for our English services.

If it is so desirable to have a uniform liturgy, it is worth our honest efforts to look about for an order of service that may serve as a model until Synod has provided us with a suitable liturgy. This, however, does not call upon any one to create an order of service and to recommend that creation for universal acceptance. If we assume the privilege of arranging our own liturgy, and thus make unwarranted use of our Christian liberty, we would have to concede the same prerogative to any one who desired to exhibit his master skill in this direction. Then our Church would suffer untold harm from every shade of subjective opinions, arrangements, and liturgical nuisances.¹¹⁾ If we essay to establish a new liturgy, or even to piece a new one together from the old *Kirchenordnungen*, we would expose ourselves to Luther's condemnation: "Grievous complaint and offense is caused by the manifold kinds of new masses, since every one fashions his own: some from good intentions, others from presumption, that they also might start something new, and appear among others as fine masters, as is always the case with Christian liberty, that a few use it otherwise than for their own pleasure and profit, and not for the glory of God and the neighbor's welfare."¹²⁾ "We would scorn the presumption and suspicion the intelligence of the pastor who would reject the Church's models and frame a liturgy of his own. There would be no possibility of arriving at a desirable uniformity of usage upon the basis of personal taste or preference."¹³⁾ The Church's models

11) HOMMEL: "Wir verschmähen es, nach eigenen Fündlein und Ideen eine Gottesdienstordnung aufzubauen; das ist der Weg der Subjektivität und des Schwankens, der nie zum Ziele führt." (*Liturgie*, 1851, p. V.)

12) X, 226.

13) *The Choral Service Book*, General Council Publ. Board, p. XXXIV.

must be our models. Our aim must be to go back to the old masters, to a liturgy that has a genuine, classic, Lutheran ring, one that reechoes and resounds to the liturgy that Luther endorses,¹⁴⁾ and that was heard in the sanctuaries of our devoted and loyal fellow-Lutherans of the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries. We must abide with both the forms and the musical settings then in use. Such a liturgy that contains the old Lutheran forms as they were used in those centuries, and that has been adapted for our use, is to be found in the so-called Common Service. And since it is claimed for this service that it is "typical pure Lutheran service of the sixteenth century adapted for the use of English-speaking churches," embodying "the common worship of the Christian Church of all ages," enjoying "the common consent of the pure Lutheran liturgies of the sixteenth century;"¹⁵⁾ and since it has been adopted by our own sister-Synod¹⁶⁾ and other bodies of the Lutheran Church in America; and since many of our own congregations have introduced it and are using it, although generally in a very badly crippled form; and since it enjoys the preference over the service of our *Agende*, being historically and liturgically more correct, and containing gems of pure Lutheran liturgies that are missing in our service, although endorsed and recommended for use by leading liturgists of our own Synod¹⁷⁾: we would like to call attention to

14) In this we agree with Frederick William III, who had commissioned Eylert to prepare a new Agenda, of which the king disapproved, saying: "Vor Ihrem guten Willen habe ich allen Respekt, aber Sie sind in den Fehler aller gefallen, die neue Liturgien und Agenden geschrieben haben. Sie haben den historischen Boden verlassen. . . . Alle Liturgien und Agenden, welche in unserer Zeit erschienen, sind wie aus der Pistole geschossen. . . . Wir müssen, soll etwas aus der Sache werden, auf Vater Luther rekurrenieren." (Rietschel, *Lehrbuch*, p. 448. *Choral Service*, p. XV.)

15) *An Explanation of the Common Service*, General Council Publ. House, p. 14.

16) *The Common Service with Music*, American Lutheran Publication Board, Pittsburg, Pa.

17) Lochner in his *Hauptgottesdienst* recommends the principal parts that are contained in the Common Service for general use. *Lehre und*

the component parts of the Common Service, hoping that this may be of some assistance in striving for our common goal: uniformity of liturgy for our English services.

After a proper hymn by the congregation, and after the pastor has intoned the Invocation of the Triune God, and the congregation has responded with Amen, the MORNING SERVICE opens with the *Confiteor*, or the *Confession of Sins*, which is to be used on Sundays when the regular services are not preceded by a confessional service. This position is different from the one in the *Agende*. The purpose of the *Confiteor* at the beginning of the service is to "prepare the hearts of both minister and congregation for communion with God. With the sincere confession of sin God does not bestow His grace upon us; nor does He accept our sacrifice of prayer, praise, and thanksgiving."¹⁸⁾ We maintain that the sermon in the Lutheran Church is not a promulgation of the Law, but rather a proclamation of the Gospel, *i. e.*, the free pardon of God toward the sinner for the sake of the sinner's Savior. The Confession and Absolution immediately after this divine assurance would seem out of place. Whether

Wehre, in reviewing the work, brought the following opinions: Graebner: "Der würde sich bei uns keinen Dank verdienen, welcher für jedes Hinwirken auf eine sorgfältige und liebvolle Behandlung der gottesdienstlichen Zeremonien, Bräuche, Formen, oder wie man diese Dinge nennen mag, nur ein gleichgültiges Abwinken, ein mitleidiges Lächeln als für Schrullen und Liebhabereien einseitiger Köpfe, oder gar ein energisches Kopfschütteln, als gälte es, gefährliche Bestrebungen abzuweisen, in Bereitschaft hätte. . . . Wir lassen uns aber durch das Bewusstsein unserer Freiheit nicht bestimmen, zu verachten oder über Bord zu werfen, was etwa von alters her in der Kirche als lieblich und schön geliebt, gelobt und geübt worden ist." — Schaller: "Obgleich die Zeit vielleicht für immer vorbei ist, in welcher man hoffen könnte, den *altlutherischen Gottesdienst* in seiner ursprünglichen Gestalt und Schönheit wieder in das Leben eingeführt zu sehen, so ist doch schon viel gewonnen, wenn das rechte Verständnis der einzelnen Bestandteile des lutherischen Hauptgottesdienstes in weiteren Kreisen gewirkt und befördert wird." — Dr. Walther: "Es ist der kostliche Schlussstein zum Wiederaufbau der wahren lutherischen Kirche in Amerika. Gott segne Dich dafür!" (*Lehre und Wehre* 34, p. 355 ff.)

18) *An Explanation*, p. 21.

the place immediately after the sermon is liturgically proper has, therefore, been disputed.¹⁹⁾ Many feel that the Confession of Sins that follows especially a festival sermon, such as on Christmas, Easter Day, etc., is not in keeping with the happy mood to which the sermon endeavored to elevate its hearers.

In studying the old Lutheran *Kirchenordnungen*, we find that there is no common consensus that would demand the position immediately after the sermon as the only correct one. Neither Luther's *Formula Missae*, 1524, nor his *Deutsche Messe*, 1526, contains it. Indeed, Luther mentions it as following the sermon, but to our knowledge he has never advocated that position. A number of the old *Kirchenordnungen* place the Confession where the Common Service has it, e. g., *Andreas ev. Mess im neuen Spital zu Nuernberg*, 1525; *Strassburg deutsches Kirchenamt*, 1525; *Brandenburg (-Ansbach) und Nuernberg*, 1533; *Wittenberg*, 1559; 1563; *Mecklenburg*, 1552; 1650; *Frankfurt a. M.*, 1565; *Lueneburg*, 1564; 1569; *Lippe*, 1571; *Oldenburg*, 1573; *Liegnitz*, 1594; and others.²⁰⁾

If, therefore, the position of the *Confiteor* in the Common Service is not by general consent the preferred one, it is, at any rate, a justifiable one, enjoying the authority and endorsement of the Lutheran liturgists of highest rank.

The service proper begins after the Confession of Sins with the *Introit*. The *Introit* is of very ancient origin. It really dates back to the services in the temple of Jerusalem, where the two divisions of the singers would sing the psalms responsively. During the first centuries of the Christian Church both the pastors and choristers entered the church at the beginning of the services in procession, singing a psalm antiphonally. The congregation would respond to each verse of the psalm with the proper Antiphon for the respective Sunday or festival. At the end of the psalm the *Gloria Patri* was sung as a confession of the Holy Trinity. This

19) Cf. *Lehre und Wehre* 54, p. 385 ff.

20) Lochner, *Hauptgottesdienst*, p. 185.

solemn opening of the service was called *introitus*. Later, however, our present form of the Introit came into use, which consisted in the Antiphon, one psalm-verse, and the Gloria Patri.

That the Introits, which were completely suppressed by Pietism and Rationalism in the time after the Thirty Years' War, have been omitted from our *Agende* is a much-deplored fact. Lochner writes: "To congregations that do not yield to the present desire to abbreviate the services more and more, but that have preserved a little more endurance from former times for the duration of a full service, the resumption of the Introits ought to be recommended."²¹⁾ Luther, in his *Weise, christliche Messe zu halten*, 1523, as well as in his *Deutsche Messe*, 1526, wants the Introit retained as an opening hymn. He says: "The Introits for the Sundays, and that are sung on the festivals of Christ, such as Easter, Pentecost, Christmas, we praise, and also retain them."²²⁾ The Introit at the beginning of the service proper puts a special stamp, the peculiar characteristic upon the Sunday for which it is set. The names of the Sundays, as Invocavit, Reminiscere, Oculi, etc., are the first words of the Latin Introits for the respective Sundays. Therefore, instead of canceling them from our order of service in conformity with the whims of Pietism and Rationalism, we should rather approve of them and gladly restore them to their former position and usage.

As far as the rendering of the Introits is concerned, it might be mentioned that the way in which this is usually done, *viz.*, that the pastor reads the Antiphon and psalm-verse, the congregation responding with the Gloria Patri, is not the correct one. Reed and Archer, in the preface to the *Choral Service*, say: "The Introit properly belongs to the choir. Any other disposition of it is simply a makeshift."²³⁾ Lochner corroborates this and writes: "The Introit is sung antiphonally by two choirs, the second being supplied a little

21) I. c., p. 81.

22) X, 2238.

23) p. XXIV.—All the Introits with their proper musical setting in psalm-tone are given in *The Choral Service Book*, pp. 96—141.

fuller than the first. The *Gloria Patri*, however, in case it is not desired to carry the change through, may be sung by both choirs, which has a real pleasing effect.”²⁴⁾ He also advises to have the Introit rendered with the help of a children’s choir: “This could be done best, according to ecclesiastical precedent, by pupils who are able and willing to sing. If they are unable to sing in several ‘voices,’ or even in two ‘voices,’ then a unisonous singing will do, which will sound quite delightful through the clear voices of the children.”²⁵⁾ Loehe remarks: “It must be mentioned that the Introit is sung best according to one of the eight psalm-tones, as long as the proper Introit melodies are not restored to our Church.” Lochner adds: “This would be done even according to Luther’s precedent.”²⁶⁾

To retain the Introits, therefore, does not belong to the impossibilities. If it cannot be otherwise, let them be rendered by the pastor and have the congregation respond with the *Gloria Patri*. It must be remembered, however, that such a disposition of it is simply a makeshift. There is in our congregations no necessity for taking refuge to such a makeshift, since we have the children of our churches in our parochial schools every day, who, with a few minutes each week devoted to a little training, will be able to render the Introits and the other propria of the choir needed in the liturgy. There is hardly a congregation anywhere that would not delight in such singing. “Should it really be impossible,” asks Lochner, “especially in our city schools, to select a number of gifted boys and to train them gradually as the proper choristers?”²⁷⁾ It is needless to add that Luther in his boyhood days sang in a boys’ choir, and that highly endorses and recommends this old Lutheran institute.

Then shall follow the *Kyrie*, according to the rubric of the Common Service. Luther says: “Then they suit me well

24) *Hauptgottesdienst*, p. 84.

25) l. c., p. 82.

26) l. c.

27) l. c., p. 31.

that have added the Kyrie Eleison.”²⁸⁾ There is a very logical connection between the Introit and the Kyrie. The Introit is the herald of the Sunday, announcing in a Gospel message God’s grace and every blessing to the worshipers. This announcement having been made, all are desirous of obtaining that mercy of God. Therefore the congregation prays: “Lord, have mercy upon us!” The prayer for mercy is uttered three times, not nine times, as in the Roman Church,—to denote that the prayer is directed to the Holy Trinity mentioned in the Gloria Patri of the Introit.

The Kyrie is, as a rule, rendered antiphonally, the minister intoning and the congregation responding. It may be rendered antiphonally by two choirs, or the choir may intone and the congregation respond. The rendering by choir and congregation would seem the more solemn manner where the pastor does not sing the liturgy.

The *Gloria in Excelsis*, which, like the Kyrie, is also prescribed by the *Agende*, is a very beautiful part of the liturgy. Luther claims, “It did not grow; nor was it made on earth; it came down from heaven.” It was first sung on Bethlehem’s fields in honor of the Savior’s birth, who had come to bring us life and salvation. So it is used to-day as an answer to the Kyrie that the congregation has just sung, as a praise for the many gracious deliverances from the manifold sorts of evil. The words themselves are grand, sublime, awe-inspiring. Luther declares: “A great deal of singing in the mass is fine and delightful . . . such as the *Gloria in Excelsis et in Terra*, the *Alleluia*, the *Patrem* (the *Creed*), the *Preface*, the *Sanctus*, the *Benedictus*, the *Agnus Dei*. In these things you find nothing of the sacrifice, but only pure praise and thanks, wherefore we have retained them in the mass.”²⁹⁾

The *Gloria in Excelsis* together with the *Laudamus* ought to be sung by the congregation. Whether the congregation will be able to sing the *Laudamus* part depends a great deal

28) X, 2235.

29) X, 2194 f.; cf. 2235 f.; 1676.

on its musical ability. Lochner's suggestion seems the most feasible way, *viz.*: "In case it cannot be attained that the congregation participates in the singing of the Laudamus, then let the choir take it; and the order would be: Pastor: 'Glory be to God on high!' Congregation: 'And on earth peace, good will toward men.' Choir: 'We praise Thee,' etc."³⁰⁾ This disposition of the Gloria in Excelsis might be adhered to until the congregation has learned to sing all of it.

The well-known *Salutation*, *Oremus*, and *Collect* require no explanation.

After the reading of the *Epistle* "the *Hallelujah* shall be sung, except in the Passion season."

That the *Sentences* for the various seasons of the Church-year after the *Hallelujah* might be omitted may be urged for the reason given in the *Choral Service* in a different connection: "The congregation too often but begins to accustom itself to one setting when another season of the church-year brings a different one into use and paralyzes the tongues in the pews."³¹⁾ A suitable hymn, instead of the *Sentences*, is just as appropriate and more practical.

The reading of the *Gospel* is considered the principal reading. This fact is emphasized by the *Gloria Tibi*, which the congregation sings as an expression of joy after the *Gospel* has been announced. After the *Gospel* has been read, in order to express its praise at the glad tidings heard, the congregation sings the *Laus Tibi*.

After the reading of the *Gospel* follows the *Creed*. By reciting the *Creed*, either the *Nicene* or the *Apostolic*, the con-

30) *Hauptgottesdienst*, p. 122. 35, § 2. Office of the choir in the public worship, p. 32 ff.

31) p. XXXVI.—**LUTHER**: "Zum vierten lasse man singen das Graduale, etwa mit zwei Versen, samt dem Halleluja, oder nur eins (von diesen beiden), nach Gefallen des Pfarrers oder Bischofs. Aber die langen Gradualien, so man in der Fasten singt, und dergleichen, so mehr denn zwei Verse haben, mag, wer da will, daheim in seinem Hause singen; in der Kirche wollen wir nicht, dass der Gläubigen Geist mit Ueberdruss gedämpft werde." (X, 2239 f.)

gregation performs one of its foremost Christian duties, in making, in a brief summary, a public confession of its faith. (Vide Matt. 10, 32; 16, 15—18; Rom. 10, 9.) The most appropriate place and time for such a confession of faith is in the principal service. The Common Service prescribes it to be recited in monotone, with soft organ accompaniment.

After the Creed follows, without prelude, a short hymn (Kanzelliell), during which the pastor enters the pulpit to deliver the *Sermon*.

Between the Sermon and the General Prayer the Common Service inserts the *Offertory*.³²⁾ The Offertory evidently has its origin in the offerings that the first Christians brought for the support of the ministry and for benevolent purposes at their *agapae* at which they celebrated the Lord's Supper. This custom in the course of time degenerated into the sacrificial mass, in which meritorious offering, or sacrifice, is made “pro innumeris peccatis et offensionibus et negligentiis meis et pro omnibus circumstantibus, sed et pro omnibus fidelibus Christianis, vivis atque defunctis.” Though Luther swept everything out of the mass, “das nach Opfer klingt und stinkt,” he, nevertheless, retained the Offertory in our present usage as a common offering of the penitent heart, and as an evidence of Christian charity.³³⁾

The *General Prayer*, the special petitions or thanksgivings which might have been requested, together with the Lord's

32) Hommel, *Liturgie*, 1851: “Von dem Grundsatz der Freiheit ausgehend, haben wir keinen Anstand genommen, das Offertorium wieder aufzunehmen.” (p. VI.) — Schoeberlein assigns the *Predigt-Nachlied* to follow the sermon. He writes: “Nachdem die Gemeinde die Predigt angehört hat, bekennt sie sich gelobend und bittend zu ihrem Inhalt im Gesang eines Liedes.” (*Hauptgottesdienst*, pp. 262. 275.) — Layritz: “Das Predigtlied findet keine bessere Stellung als eben nach der Predigt, so dass die durch die Predigt zubereiteten Herzen nun entweder den Hauptinhalt derselben sich noch einmal selber gegenseitig bezeugen oder die Lob- und Dankopfer ihrer Lippen für das verkündigte Wort dem Herrn darbringen.” (*Kern des deutschen Kirchengesangs* IV, p. VII.)

33) During the singing of the Offertory the offerings are gathered and brought to the minister, who places them on the altar. (Cf. Luther, X, 229, § 9.)

Prayer, are to be read at the altar. This is done in view of the purpose that the altar has in the Lutheran churches. Although it is not regarded as a sacred shrine of the consecrated host, nor as a sepulcher for the bones of some of the famous or infamous saints, yet it is considered the proper place, not only for the administration of the Sacrament of the Altar, but especially also where the called minister of Christ offers the congregation's sacrifices of prayer and praise. Therefore, the General Prayer, as well as all liturgical prayers, ought to be read at the altar.

"If there be no communion, a *Doxology* may be sung, and the minister, standing at the altar, shall pronounce the *Benediction*, after which the congregation shall offer silent prayer." (Rubric.)

The *Communion Service* is virtually the same as that of the *Agende*, except that the Common Service prescribes the Exhortation after the Sanctus, the Pax after the Words of Institution, the Nunc Dimittis after all have communed, and the Benedicamus after the Collect.

Although the *Exhortation* has the endorsement of the highest authority, and though it would be of benefit to the communicants when used, yet it seems to be used but very little, especially where a confessional, or preparatory, service precedes the regular services.

Of the *Pax* Luther says: "The *Pax Domini* should be read, which is a public absolution of sins for all that go to the sacrament, and is, indeed, a real evangelical word that pronounces forgiveness of sins, and the only and most worthy preparation for the Lord's Table, if it is apprehended by faith, not otherwise than if Christ had spoken out of His own mouth."³⁴⁾

The *Nunc Dimittis* is a very appropriate hymn of joyful thanksgiving at the end of a Communion Service, for which the Common Service provides a beautiful setting in psalm-tone.

34) X, 2243 f.

"And for the Ite, missa est, the *Benedicamus Domini* should be sung."³⁵⁾ Herein the communicants, as well as the entire congregation, offer their thanks to the Lord for the benefits received in the sacrament and in the whole service.—

Let this suffice in indicating the appropriateness and value of the several parts of the Common Service. Much more could be said. The little that has been said could have been said much better. A special chapter might be written on the Vespers; but if we understand the Morning Service and agree on that, no serious difficulties will present themselves in studying the Evening Service. This service is strictly Lutheran, very beautiful, a liturgical treat, and easily learned.

A word may be added in regard to the *Service Music*. If we adopt the forms as they are contained in the old Lutheran church books, we must also use the music that was set to those forms. Both have been handed down to us together. The liturgy and its music together form a unit. Indeed, most of the forms have a number of good Lutheran musical settings; but to discard the old classic music, in order to replace it with compositions of our own, or with the effeminate productions of modern composers, is committing a liturgical nuisance. Such treatment of the old, venerable forms evidences liturgical ignorance, as well as a lack of appreciation for musical art. If we are shown a statue of Luther, we expect to see him clothed in the quaint apparel and style of his age. We would not even consider it natural to see him arrayed in a suit of clothes made according to the latest fashion of a modern tailor. But why should we act so unreasonably in liturgies? Why divorce the music from its liturgy? We have every right to claim for our ecclesiastic music: "It comes down to us through the centuries as a precious inheritance . . . and stands before us to-day, not a crude, undeveloped, or traditional nondescript, but a completed, fully developed art-form, hoary with ages and hallowed with centuries of holy service, but with the vigor and purity of never-fading youth."³⁶⁾

35) Luther, X, 2244.

36) *The Choral Service Book*, p. VII.

The Service Music is endorsed by the most eminent musicians. Mozart, *c. g.*, declared of the historical Preface melody as found in the Common Service, "If he could truthfully say that he was the author of this melody, he would gladly forego whatever other musical reputation he might possess."³⁷⁾ So in adopting the forms, let us also adopt the music that was set to those forms, and thereby forego the trouble of looking about for "something better."

To congregations that have not been made thoroughly acquainted with the Common Service and its various parts, it will seem intricate and difficult. Yet, by familiarizing ourselves and our congregations with these "liturgical gems of our Church" these objections, we hope, will be overcome. Until this is done, it may be best to abide with the order of the *Agende*, and to borrow the necessary musical settings from the Common Service. Of course, "there are those to-day who attach but little importance to the cultivation and employment of the beautiful in divine worship. Though at great pains to indulge their artistic tastes in their homes and their social relations, when they come to worship they prefer to deaden the aesthetic sense the Creator gave them, and commune with their God with self-crippled powers. Such worship is not the humble offering of Mary, but rather the sinful withholding of Ananias. We must ever strive to bring unto God an offering of every fruit of our mind and hand, the first and best."³⁸⁾ It is our duty as pastors and Christians to see that everything within our congregations is done decently and in order. This duty pertains also to the order of service. And when we essay to establish such an order, let us be of the determination that the best is not too good.

Indeed, if we would simply announce that, beginning with next Sunday and for all times to come, the full Common Service must be used, and introduce it by our own authority, it is needless to say that a presumption of this kind would be

37) *I. c.*, p. XXVI.

38) *I. c.*, p. XXXVII.

little appreciated. The congregation must be taught. The service must be thoroughly explained. The meaning of its various parts must be elucidated. The beauty and art of its music must be shown. And then, not the pastors, but the congregations must decide whether they wish to introduce the liturgy or not. "We reject and condemn also as wrong when these ordinances are urged by force upon the congregation of God as necessary."³⁹⁾

However, let us not pay first attention to our own convenience and ease, but rather act according to the admonition of the Apostle: "Whatsoever things are pure, whatsoever things are lovely, think of these things." Let it ever be our aim to beautify the services in the tabernacles of the Lord of hosts to the edification of His redeemed and to the praise and honor of His holy name!

Fort Smith, Ark.

H. W. BARTELS.

THE RISE OF ANTICHRIST.

Tu regere imperio populos, Romane, memento,
Hae tibi erunt artes. — *Aeneis*, VI, 852. 853.

I.

The rise of Antichrist was to be gradual. "The mystery of iniquity doth already work: only he who now letteth will let (hinder), until he be taken out of the way," 2 Thess. 2, 7.

The rise of the Pope was gradual. Bishop Hall writes: "Antichrist was conceived in the primeval times, saw the light in Boniface III, and was grown to his stature and acme in Gregory VII."

Archbishop Whately says: "No one can point out any precise period at which this 'mystery of iniquity' first began, or specify any person who first introduced it; no one, in fact, ever did introduce any such system; the corruptions crept

39) Form. Conc. II, ch. X, § 27.

in one by one, and gradually changed her bridal purity for the accumulated defilements of the mother of harlots." (*On the Origin of Romish Errors*, quoted in Bishop McIlvaine's *Justification*, p. 35.)

The rise of Antichrist was to be against difficulties. "He who now letteth will let" (hinder), 2 Thess. 2, 7.

The rise of the Pope was against difficulties. The Roman empire persecuted the Christians, and during this period the papacy could not develop very well.

Tertullian, who wrote early in the third century against the charge that Christians were unconcerned for the safety of the Roman emperor, says: "We are under a particular necessity of praying for the emperors, and for the continued state of the empire, because we know that the dreadful power which hangs over the whole world, and the conclusion of the age, which threatens the most horrible evils, is retarded or delayed by the time appointed for the continuance of the Roman empire."

On 2 Thess. 2, 7 he says: "Who but the Roman empire, which being dispersed into ten of kings, shall introduce Antichrist?" Again: "Christians pray for the Roman emperors, for by their continuing to do so the grievous calamity of Antichrist is hindered."

Ambrose says: "After the death of the Roman emperors, Antichrist appears."

Chrysostom, in the fifth century, says on 2 Thess. 2, 7: "When the Roman empire shall be taken out of the way, then shall the Man of Sin come; when that shall be overthrown, he shall invade the empire and attempt the rule of man and God." (Loomis, p. 47.)

The coming of Antichrist was to be "after the working of Satan, with all power and signs and lying wonders, and with all deceivableness of unrighteousness," 2 Thess. 2, 9, 10.

The coming of the Pope was of that nature.

When Christ poured out the Holy Ghost on Pentecost and Peter preached, three thousand were converted, and thus the Christian Church was born in Jerusalem, the cradle of Christianity and the first chief Christian city, and the Clementine Romance represents James as the bishop and head.

Persecuted at Jerusalem, the Christians scattered abroad, and in Acts 16, 5 we read: "So were the churches established in the faith, and increased in numbers daily." Ignatius, Pliny, Tacitus, Justin, Papylus, Melito, Irenaeus, Clemens Alexandrinus, Polycrates, Tertullian, Origen, Maximinus Daza's Rescript to Sabinus, Lactantius, and Eusebius, all bear witness to the swift and wide spread of the Gospel. (Harnack, *Expansion II*, 147—170.)

Tertullian tells us Tiberius tried to include Jesus among the Roman gods, but the Senate hindered it. (*Apol.* 5; Suetonius, *Life of Claudius*, 25.) And Eusebius says, "being obviously pleased with the doctrine," Tiberius threatened "death to the accusers of the Christians." (II, c. 2.) At any rate, in the days of Claudius, 41—54, and Nero, 54—68, a Christian church was formed in Rome. On his arrival in Italy, Paul "found brethren" at Puteoli, and a week later Christians came out from Rome to greet him. In 64 the Christians in Rome were a "huge multitude," according to Tacitus (*Annals* 15, 44), at least 50,000, according to Gibbon (1, 15), possibly 150,000, according to later investigators.

Paul wrote his great letter to the Roman Christians, and there he suffered martyrdom; Peter was also probably martyred at Rome, and so the Roman church was supposed to have been founded by two Apostles, and this fact made the Bishop of Rome an important person.

At this time Rome was the mistress of the world and the center of commerce. The population has been estimated all the way from 600,000 to 1,500,000. All roads led to Rome, and Christians from every nook and corner of the vast empire came to Rome at one time or another for one purpose

or another, and became acquainted with the bishop of the world's greatest city, and so he naturally became widely known, and the faith of the Roman Christians was "proclaimed throughout the whole world," even in Paul's day, Rom. 1, 8.

Influential people joined the Church: the Proconsul Sergius Paulus; the Consul Titus Flavius Clemens and his wife Domitilla; a "distinguished lady," Pomponia Graecina; Justin Martyr; Valentinus; Ptolemaeus; Heracleon; Marcion, the Senator (?); Apollonius; the distinguished lawyer Tertullian, who says Christianity has gained the palace, the senate, the forum, and the army. Similar testimony is borne by Clement, Origen, Pliny's letter to Caesar, Cyprian, Eusebius, Minutius Felix, the second rescript of Emperor Valerian, in 258, which notices only the upper classes and members of Caesar's household. (Harnack, *Expansion* II, 182—239.)

Marcia, the morganatic wife of Emperor Commodus, who was brought up by the Roman presbyter Hyacinthus, about 189 asked Bishop Victorinus for the names of Christians in the unhealthy lead mines of Sardinia and had Commodus set them free, and under her influence the persecutions died away. (Gwatkin, I, 170, 171.) Such powerful persons naturally added prestige to the Bishop of the Church at Rome.

The Church at Rome became wealthy at an early date and used its wealth in works of charity. Marcion donated 200,000 sesterces to the Church. About 170, Bishop Dionysius of Corinth writes to the Romans: "From the beginning ye have been wont to show forth divers good works towards all the brethren. To many churches in divers towns have ye sent supplies, and in this manner either relieved the poverty of the needy, or provided necessary sustenance for the brethren in the mines. By such gifts do ye as Romans remain faithful to the customs inherited from your fathers." "The fostering Mistress of Charity," Ignatius of Antioch calls them on his way to martyrdom at Rome in his first epistle to the Corinthians.

The Roman Christians were zealous missionaries. As early as 156 King Lucius asked them for missionaries to Britain, according to Tertullian and Bede. There were bishops in Mainz and Koeln as early as 185. In 180 Christians from Madaura and Numidia in North Africa were martyrs. There were Christians in Spain in the days of Irenaeus and Tertullian; they were numerous in the days of Cyprian. (Harnack, *Expansion II.*)

About the year 200 the Clementine Romance was brought to Rome with a letter from Clement to James at Jerusalem, telling how Peter had ordained him, and set him in his own chair of teaching as Bishop of Rome. While the doctrinal part was rejected as heretical, the narrative part was readily believed and has been the traditional Roman account ever since. The consequence was drawn, that, as Peter was the chief of the Apostles, the Pope was the chief of all bishops. On this basis the popes, as time went on, claimed ever-growing power.

Towards the end of the first century the Church of Rome sent letters to the Corinthians urging them to stop their church quarrel; these letters are supposed to have been written by Bishop Clement, a freedman of the Flavian imperial house, and so respected were they, that they were read publicly in the churches for a century.

Bishop Victor, 189—198, tries to be a lord over the Asiatics in the matter of Easter celebration. Calixtus I, 217—222, bases his arbitrary decision upon his “power of the keys,” *i. e.*, upon the judicial authority bestowed by the Lord on the Apostles, and in particular on St. Peter.

Tertullian accuses the Roman bishop of taking the title “Pontifex Maximus” and “Bishop of Bishops;” he complains also that the “Supreme Pontiff” was in the habit of quoting the decisions of his predecessors as final in disputes, and that he claimed to sit in Peter’s chair. These charges show the early date of the Petrine claim.

“At the end of the second century we can already recog-

nize by signs which it is impossible to mistake the spirit which in 1870 will proclaim the Infallibility of the Pope." (Renan, *Hibbert Lect.* 1880; Engl. tr. 172—174.)

In 222 Emperor Alexander Severus permitted the Church to own lands, to build churches, to elect officers openly, and to send officials to court; this was made lawful in 312.

St. Cyprian of Carthage, died 258, insists on the equality of all bishops, but he makes them wield priestly authority, and he urges the unity of the Church represented in St. Peter. The egg laid at Carthage was hatched at Rome.

Emperor Septimius, about 200, oppressed the Christians, but under Caracalla, Elagabalus, and Alexander Severus they developed undisturbed. According to Bishop Cornelius, about 250, there were in office in Rome forty-six presbyters, seven deacons, seven subdeacons, forty-two acolytes, fifty-two exorcists, not to mention the precentors, while those receiving charity numbered more than fifteen hundred. By the year 300 there were forty churches in Rome, Optatus of Mileve tells us.

Even at this early day it is reported that Emperor Decius said a rival emperor was not as vexatious as a new Roman bishop, and thinking the Christians dangerous to the State, he organized the first general persecution, and Cornelius was martyred in September, 253, and Sixtus II on August 6, 258.

The persecution of the Christians centered in Rome, and naturally made the bishop a very prominent leader with religious, social, and also political duties.

Stephen I, 254—257, tried to enforce his view on heretical baptism on the ground that, as occupant of the chair of St. Peter, chief of the Apostles, he ranked above the other bishops.

Bishop Dionysius of Rome, 261—272, wrote to Bishop Dionysius of Alexandria that his terms in defining the Trinity were erroneous, and he submitted, and said he had been misunderstood.

In 270 Emperor Aurelian decided that no one not appointed by the “bishops of Italy and Rome” should remain in the see of Antioch.

About this time the churches had begun to display architectural splendor.

Urged on by Galerius, Diocletian, in 303, ordered the fiercest persecution of all who refused to sacrifice to the emperor, and the giving up of all the Bibles to be burned. Sinking under a loathsome disease, Galerius, in 311, issued an edict that Christians might exercise their religion, and that churches should be spared or rebuilt.

In 313 Constantine issued the Edict of Milan in Greek and Latin over the whole empire, placing Christianity on the same level with paganism and forbidding persecutions under severe penalties. Exiles were recalled; confiscated property was restored; the Christian clergy were exempt from military and municipal duties, a favor already enjoyed by pagan priests and Jewish rabbis. In 315 the freeing of Christian slaves was made easier. In 316 various customs and ordinances offensive to Christians were abolished. In 321 bequests to churches were legalized and civic business forbidden on Sunday, but as a “dies solis.” In 323 Jupiter, Apollo, Mars, and Hercules were removed from the coins. In 324 the emperor issued a general exhortation to all Romans to embrace the new creed for the common weal. The highest offices were opened to Christians. Gifts and remission of taxes enriched the churches, and many churches were erected, and fifty costly manuscripts of the Bible were ordered prepared for the leading churches. The cult of Venus in Phoenicia, Aesculapius at Aegae, and the Nile-priests at Heliopolis were forbidden, also private haruspices, probably even all sacrifices.

Constantine divided the empire into four prefectures, these into fourteen “dioceses,” these into provinces. The Church divided along these political lines. The chief city, or metropolis, gave to its bishop the name Primate or Metropolitan; the metropolis of a diocese conferred on its pastor

the title Exarch; over the exarchs were placed the four Patriarchs, corresponding to the four praetorian prefects.

In 316 the first great Western synod was held at Arles, Constantine being present, and Bishop Marinus president. In 325 Constantine called the first general Church Council at Nicaea, presided at times, required all bishops to sign the creed, and dismissed it with a splendid feast.

At Nicaea the bishops of Rome, Alexandria, and Antioch were recognized as the heads of their respective provinces. Since Rome was the ancient glorious capital city of the Roman empire, the Bishop of Rome naturally was the most prominent bishop of all.

The rights of the Roman bishop extend over the "suburbicarian" churches, probably the seven provinces of Campania, Tuscany, with Umbria, Picenum, Apulia with Calabria, Brustii with Lucania, Samnium, and Valeria, and the islands of Corsica, Sardinia, and Sicily. (Robertson, *Growth*, p. 57.)

In the East there were four Patriarchs, in the West but one; that alone made the Roman loom large. In the rivalry between the Patriarchs of Antioch, and Alexandria, and Constantinople, the Bishop of Rome was often appealed to, and this fact naturally added greatly to Rome's influence.

The controversy as to the date of Easter was ended by the Council of Nicaea in favor of Rome against the Asiatics.

Constantine kept company continually with bishops and was fond of talking on religious subjects; he even wrote little sermons, which he delivered to his admiring hearers. He was spoken of by Eusebius—not the historian—as "a sort of general bishop," and he spoke of himself as "a bishop in externals."

Constantine became virtually the Pontifex Maximus of his new religion by controlling those who performed the sacred rites, and by defining its faith, discipline, organization, policy, and privileges. He enacted legislation for Christianity just as

his predecessors had for paganism. That the union did paganize and materialize the Church no one can deny.

And Dante laments:—

Ah! Constantine, what evil came as child,
Not of thy change of creed, but of the dower
Of which the first rich father thee beguiled!

When the emperor left Rome, in 326, to live at Constantinople, and gave his Lateran palace to Sylvester and his successors, the Roman bishop leaped into much greater power; the Romans looked upon their active and present bishop as their king rather than upon the very distant emperor. In 352—356 Pope Liberius dared defy the emperor in a matter relating to Athanasius.

The Roman Catholic Joseph Rafele of Naples, in the eighteenth century, says: "The transfer of the empire to Constantinople was the origin of the influence of the Western clergy, and especially of the Roman bishop." He goes on to show how the Popes helped the Frankish kings, and how these helped the Popes, "who did not yet dare call themselves sovereigns of Rome." (Schick, 56.)

A pompous ritualism, with suggestions of image worship, was introduced. Great emphasis was laid on the sanctity and power of holy water, sacred relics and places, pilgrimages, and the use of the cross. New ideas in reference to the merit of external works resulted in asceticism and a celibate priesthood, fanatical martyrdom, indiscriminate alms-giving, and various patent methods for spiritual benefits. The number of church festivals grew and now included Easter, Pentecost, Epiphany, and various saints' days.

When Constantine became a Christian in name and used the imperial power to enforce uniformity of creed, and the Church, instead of repudiating this interference of the State in church affairs, accepted his help, the Inquisition was born. About 316 Constantine issued an edict condemning the Donatists to lose their goods. In 382 Theodosius declared the Manicheans guilty of death, and confiscated their goods.

Charles the Great and Charles the Bald ordered every bishop to inquire into, and correct, the errors of the people, and placed the secular power in the service of the Church. (Bain, *Devel.*, 158.)

The emperors set the example of giving immense donations of lands and money to the various churches, especially to the great churches of the principal cities, and most of all to the primatial church at Rome, the capital of the civilized world. The example of the emperors was, of course, followed by all classes of society. The real estate of the Church was called the "patrimony of Peter" and now grew so quickly that the Pope became the largest real estate holder and the greatest financial power in all Italy. (*Real.* 14, p. 769.)

From the conversion of Emperor Constantine, in 312, and still more from the time of Theodosius the Great, 379, the Church made great strides forward in power and wealth. Jerome writes: "The Church under the emperors was greater in power and wealth, but she was less in virtues." Bishop Wordsworth of Lincoln wrote: "In the ante-Nicene age the world had been arrayed *against* the Church; but in the next period the world worked *in* the Church; and it caused more injury to the faith than when arrayed against it." (Puller, 131.)

The State had to check the rapacity of the Church:—

"We forbid clerics, or those who say they have taken vows of chastity and celibacy, to enter the houses of widows and wards, and they shall not be permitted to profit by the liberality of these women, into whose graces and familiarity they have insinuated themselves, under the guise of religion. We ordain that if such woman have given them anything, even in her last will, it shall be null, and they shall be unable to acquire anything, either by gift or testament, not even through the intervention of a fiduciary or other third person; and if it should happen that after this decree they should capture either by gift or testament of such woman any property, that property shall be confiscated." (*Cod. Theod.*,

lib. XVI. B. Willard-Archer, p. 37; Gibbon's *Decline*, chap. XXV.)

Jerome writes to Nepotianus: "The priests of idols, players, chariooteers of the circus, harlots even, can freely receive legacies and donations, and it has been necessary to make a law excluding clerics and monks from this right. Who has made such a law? The persecuting emperors? No; but Christian emperors. I do not complain of the law, but I complain bitterly that we should have deserved it. But our avarice has not been restrained by it. We laugh at it, and evade it by setting up trustees." St. Ambrose also implies that such a law was needed. (Puller, 137.)

The "Apostolical Constitutions," the "Canons of the Holy Apostles," and the decrees of the councils of Elvira in 306, Arles in 316, Neo-Caesarea in 314, and Nicaea in 325, all reveal the worldliness of the clergy in the laws passed against their engaging in worldly pursuits, frequenting taverns and gambling houses, accepting usury, habits of vagrancy, taking bribes, and immorality. Hilary, Basil, and other Fathers deplored the vices of the clergy.

The fervent and eloquent Roman Catholic Count Montalambert quotes and adopts the words of Guizot: "The sovereigns and the immense majority of the people had embraced Christianity; but at bottom civil society was pagan; it retained the institutions, the laws, and the manners of paganism. It was a society which paganism, and not Christianity, had made." Montalambert adds: "This paganism . . . was paganism under its most degenerate form. Nothing has ever equaled the abject condition of the Romans of the empire. With the ancient freedom, all virtue, all manliness disappeared." (Puller, 132.)

Ammianus Marcellinus, a heathen historian of about 390, writes: "No wonder that for so magnificent a prize as the bishopric of Rome men should contest with the utmost eagerness and obstinacy. To be enriched by the lavish donations of the principal females of the city; to ride, splendidly

attired, in a stately chariot; to sit at a profuse, luxurious, more than imperial table—these are the rewards of successful ambition."

Even the rich patricians envied the wealth of the higher clergy. When Pope Damasus tried to convert Praetextatus, he replied, "If you will make me bishop of Rome, I will at once become a Christian." Evidently Rome, too, was worth a mass, as later Paris to Henry IV.

In 343 (347?) a council met at Sardica in Illyria, composed of about 95 Western and two Eastern bishops; it was a local council, not general, for the 74 Oriental and 5 Occidental bishops seceded and held a council at Philippopolis in Thrace. The third Sardican canon, proposed by Hosius, forbids bishops to call in other bishops to judge in their differences, but "if it please your charity," let a condemned bishop ask Julius, Bishop of Rome, to appoint judges from the neighboring bishops for a new trial.

The local Sardican Synod voted this right to Julius; he did not have it before. He could act only when the case was freely brought to him; he could not draw a case before his forum. Only very definite, limited cases could be brought before him. He could not try the case in person nor have any voice in the decision. This power to receive appeals was voted to Julius personally, not to his successors; but we let that pass and grant it.

This limited jurisdiction of the Roman bishop was revolutionary in character and disastrous in its effect on the Church in course of time. (Puller, 154; Robertson, *Growth*, 70.)

The power was conferred "in honor of the memory" of St. Peter, and hence it was soon claimed as an inherent prerogative of the apostolical See of Rome; it gave to the Pope power previously possessed alone by the Emperor.

In 355 Pope Felix secured from the emperor an order to try all clerics before the Pope and forbidding an appeal to the civil courts.

After the death of Liberius, in 366, Ursinus and the Spaniard Damasus fought for the papal honor. The churches were stained with blood, 137 men were killed in one day in one church. The Pontifical Book says: "Damasus won because he had the greater number on his side." Such shameful bloody riots often took place at the election of Popes, especially from the eighth to the eleventh centuries. Damasus induced Jerome to translate the Bible into Latin, the Vulgate.

In 378 a Synod asked the nineteen-year-old Emperor Gratian to compel rebellious bishops in Italy and Illyricum to be tried at Rome. By one stroke of the pen he gave to the Pope Damasus patriarchal jurisdiction over the whole Western empire and placed the civil power at his command. This rescript made the Pope a sort of spiritual prefect of the praetorium throughout the West. As the prefects had their vicars, so Damasus appointed Bishop Archolius of Thessalonica the first Apostolic Vicar. He tried in vain to rule the Eastern Church. St. Basil speaks of him as vain, haughty, and supercilious. (Puller, 128—176.)

Epiphanius gives a list of 43 distinct heresies in his day among the Eastern bishops, but the Bishop of Rome stood consistently for the orthodox, the winning side, and that lent great influence to the bishop of the West. St. Jerome besought the "Sun of righteousness—in the West" to teach him the true doctrine, because "here in the East all is weed and wild oats."

Emperor Theodosius I ended the religious controversy with the decree of February 27, 380: "All the peoples over whom we rule with mildness and clemency must—such is our will—accept the religion transmitted by the divine Apostle St. Peter to the Romans." This was also the preface to Justinian's code of civil law.

Heretics could no longer give the name church to their places of meeting.

In 381 the second General Council, the first Council of Constantinople, decreed: "Let the bishops who are over a diocese not invade churches which are beyond their bounds,

nor cause confusion in churches." Also: "Let the Bishop of Constantinople have the precedence of honor next to the Bishop of Rome, forasmuch as it is New Rome (*Junior Roma*)."

In 285 the usurper Maximus executed Priscillian, the first instance on record of death imposed as a Christian penalty for theological error.

In 386 Pope Siricius issued the first authentic papal Decretal, to Himerius of Tarragona, expecting the Roman usage as to clerical celibacy and heretical baptism to be followed, and directing him to communicate the rescript to all Spanish churches. To these papal Decretals the Roman canonists afterwards attached as much importance as to the Bible. The Popes were ashamed to base their asserted legislative power on the rescript of the Emperor Gratian, and so they fell back upon their vague claim to be successors of Peter in his chair, and of Peter living in them and acting through them. (Puller, 183.)

This first authentic papal Decretal is also remarkable from the fact that it lays down the rule for the celibacy of the clergy. Celibacy detached the clergy from their families and other orders of society and attached them to the Pope, and thus gave a vast increase to his power. He writes: "We bear the burdens of all that are heavy laden; nay, rather the blessed Apostle Peter bears them in us, who, as we trust, in all things protects and guards us, the heirs of his administration."

Of the nine Roman councils in the fourth century one canon, of 386, forbids the consecration of a bishop without the knowledge of the Roman Patriarch.

In 398 the emperor ordered Flavian of Antioch to Rome for trial; he refused, but compromised with the Pope.

At the end of the fourth century, 384, Optatus of Mileve says: "As Peter represents the one apostolic power, from which the apostolic power of the others are only various effluences, so the power of the bishops of the other churches sustains a similar relation to the one Roman episcopal power." (Schick, 58.)

Ambrose of Milan (died 397) gave the Bishop of Rome the same position in the Church that the emperor had in the empire, but at the same time called Peter's primacy one of confession and faith, not of rank, and put Paul on an equality with Peter.

From 402 to 417 Innocent I greatly enlarged the power of the Pope. When the Goths came into Italy and the power of the Western emperors sank, the power of the Roman bishop grew. In 408 Alaric sacked Rome, gave sanctuary to all who were in the Christian churches, dispersed the pagans, and destroyed their temples, and thus increased the power of the Roman bishops.

Innocent also assumed jurisdiction over the prefecture of Eastern Illyria, which took in all the country from the Danube to the southern border of Greece, and appointed Rufus of Thessalonica his vicar or resident legate to settle minor matters and send important ones to Rome for final decision.

Writing to Bishop Decentius of Eugubium, Innocent lays it down that all churches ought to follow the usages of Rome. In 415 he wrote Exsuperius of Toulouse that it is the bounden duty of all churches to follow the decisions of Rome. Innocent also used very lofty language as to the dignity of his see in replying to the Africans when they asked him to join them in condemning Pelagius. Innocent makes a direct connection between the alleged Petrine succession and the primacy of Christendom, and he is thus the real founder of the papal monarchy. He was the first to claim a general prerogative, as "the one single fountain-head which fertilizes the whole world by its manifold streamlets," to revise the judgment of provincial synods, and thus to legislate by his own fiat for the whole Church.

Pope Zosimus sent a "Tractoria," or circular letter, to be signed by all bishops as a test of orthodoxy in condemning Pelagius. This is the first example of such a document issued from Rome. In his letter to the Africans Zosimus makes the broadest assertion which had yet been made of the

Roman pretensions. He declares the authority of the Roman See to be such that no one may dare question its decisions, and that the successors of St. Peter inherit from him an authority equal to that which our Lord gave to Peter himself. (Robertson, *Growth*, p. 88.)

When the African Apiarius, in 418, appealed to Zosimus at Rome, the Pope interfered on the basis of the *local* Sardican canons of 347, which he tried to palm off as those of the General Council of Nicaea of 325. His successor, Boniface I, did the same. When the Council of Carthage, in 419, searched the Nicene canons, the attempted fraud was discovered, and the Africans wrote Rome they would not tolerate such insolent conduct. St. Augustine was one of the signers.

In 424 Pope Celestine again tried to palm off the Sardican canons as Nicene; again the Africans emphatically repudiated the Roman's claim to jurisdiction over churches other than his own. (Puller, 187—202.)

In a council at Rome, August 11, 430, Pope Celestine ventured upon a bold and unprecedented step toward Nestorius, Patriarch of Constantinople, the prelate next in dignity to himself. He announced that unless Nestorius, within ten days after the receipt of the Roman letter, renounced his errors, and conformed to the faith of Rome and Alexandria, he was to be cut off from the communion of the Universal Church, and his flock were to avoid him as one excommunicate. Certainly a very startling pretension.

Leo I became Pope in 440 and the "Founder of the Mediaeval Papacy."

Rafael in the Vatican painted Leo at the head of an imperial embassy meeting the Huns threatening Rome; in the sky above the Pope are Peter and Paul with drawn swords. We know other reasons led Attila to withdraw, but in the eyes of the people Leo was their savior from "the Scourge of God." Once more, after many centuries, Rome had her "pater patriae," her Father of the Fatherland.

In order to destroy the independence of the manly Hilary

of Arles, Leo got the dissolute Emperor Valentinian III, a mere lad, to decree, in 445, likely by Leo's dictation: "Then only will peace continue throughout the Church when the Bishop of Rome is recognized by all as Lord and Master. . . . Henceforth it shall not be permitted to dispute over church matters or to oppose the orders of the Primate in Rome. . . . What is ordered by the Apostolic See, by virtue of its authority, shall be law to all, so that, if a bishop refuse compliance with the judicial sentence of the Roman Primate, he shall be compelled by the provincial government to appear before him." This is the charter of the modern papacy; it makes the Pope's word law and places into his hands the "big stick" of the whole power of the emperor.

It may be added that Hilary never yielded, and yet is a saint in the Roman Martyrology, his day being May 5. (Krueger, 33; Puller, 214; Littledale, *P. R.*, 240.)

Leo himself truly said: "The wide extent of the Roman realm served the expansion of the Church." Yes, indeed, very much so!

Emperor Theodosius II called the "Robber Synod" of Ephesus in 449, but Pope Leo I excused himself on the double ground of serious preoccupation and the absence of any precedent for the attendance of a Pope, but promising to send legates to represent him.

In a letter of Theodoret, Bishop of Cyrus, to Pope Leo, the grounds for Rome's precedence are recounted, but there is no mention of the privilege of Peter, Leo's constant text.

Against the expressed wish of Pope Leo, Marcian summoned a General Council at Nicaea, on September 1, 451, transferred to Chalcedon by imperial decree. The legates called on the council to accept the Tome of Leo absolutely, and on the express ground that, having been issued by the Universal Pope and representative of St. Peter, it was binding on the whole Church by virtue of such publication. But the council adjourned for five days, extended to seven, during which they compared Leo's teaching with the creeds of Nicaea,

Constantinople, and Ephesus, and demanded minute explanations from the legates of certain phrases. After that they accepted Leo's teaching. And the Roman legates themselves made the same admission: "It is clear that the faith of Pope Leo is the same as that of the Fathers of Nicaea and Constantinople, and that there is no difference. That is the reason why the Pope's letter, which has restated this faith because of the heresy of Eutyches, has been received."

At Chalcedon the Pope's legates for the first time obtained the presidency of a General Council, though the Patriarch of Constantinople was joined with them, and they had no privileges beyond the other members. Here also a party of Alexandrian bishops for the first time called the Pope "*Ecclesiastical* Archbishop, and Patriarch of the great Rome."

Despite the protest and the leaving of the assembly by the Roman legates, the Council of 630 bishops unanimously and without debate accepted the 28th canon: "The Fathers suitably bestowed precedence on the throne of Old Rome, because it was the Imperial City," and affirmed the secondary place of Constantinople. On his return, Paschasius produced a falsified copy of the Nicene canons, reading: "The Roman Church hath always held the primacy." When the genuine Greek texts were produced in reply, no such words were found. Rome had to give in, formally and publicly, in the Synod of Constantinople, in 859.

Leo I for a third time tried to pass off the Sardican canons for Nicene and stooped to downright forgery. The Sardican canons were passed under Julius, in 343 or 347, and Leo substituted the name of Sylvester, who was bishop when the Nicene canons were passed in 325!

In 428 the Arian Vandals became masters of Northern Africa, and in their distress the orthodox Christians sought the Pope's help on any terms, and his interference erstwhile so stoutly resisted was now admitted without objection, and so the Pope's power made another long stride forward.

Pope Leo introduced an important novelty by establishing

a bishop at Constantinople as his representative to overlook and coerce the Patriarch of that city and interfere in the internal affairs of that church, and only the death of Anatolius, in 458, prevented an open breach. Du Pin writes: "Leo extended his pastoral vigilance over all churches of the East and West."

In a sermon on June 29, the Feast of Saints Peter and Paul, Leo says: "They are the men through whom thou, O Rome, didst first receive the light of the Gospel of Christ. . . . The Apostles have so magnified thee that, because of Peter's Chair, thou art become the holy nation, the chosen people, the priestly and royal city, the head of the world." (Krueger, 36.)

Pope Leo I was the first to say, God made blessed Peter the chief of all the Apostles, the original depositary, and wills that from him, as from a sort of head, His gifts should flow down to the whole body. (Ep. 10, 1; Serm. 4, 2.)

Bishop Gore writes of Leo the Great: "Saint as he was, he was wonderfully unscrupulous in asserting the claims of his see, and strangely blinded in conscience to the authority of truth when he quoted, as a canon of Nicaea, what had been shown to demonstration to be a canon of Sardica and not of Nicaea." (*Rom. Cath. Claims*, pp. 78, 110.)

Pope Felix III tried the same tactics yet a fourth time to force Acacius of Constantinople.

In 1875 the Roman theologian Aloysius Vincenzi confessed the spuriousness of these, as Sardican canons.

Leo's successor, Hilarius, pushed Leo's claims on the Gallican churches, demanding them to refer to Rome all graver questions for decision. But he admitted that his vast authority had a *civil* origin. He accepted the title, "Vicar of Peter, to whom, since the resurrection of Christ, belonged the keys of the kingdom."

Pope Simplicius, 468—483, encroached on the rights of the bishop of Ravenna, and he appointed a permanent legate in Spain.

Pope Felix III cited Acacius, Patriarch of Constantinople, to appear at Rome for trial. The Pope's legates held public communion with Acacius and other supporters of the Emperor Zeno's Henoticon. Acacius was excommunicated together with the legates. Pope Felix III thus became the responsible author of the first great schism in the Catholic Church. All this he did as head of all the churches, having the care of all. (Puller, 277.) Tillemont says later Popes called on saints whom, while living, their predecessors rejected from communion. Felix III, in 484, deposed Peter the Fuller, Patriarch of Antioch.

In a letter to the Emperor Zeno, Felix III calls himself the Vicar of Peter. The Savior speaks in His Apostle, and the Apostle speaks in his vicar. From Vicars of St. Peter the Popes later on called themselves Vicars of Christ.

In all these controversies the Popes had strong allies in the enemy's camp—the monks, who were usually inclined to disobey their bishops and obey the Pope, be the cause good or bad.

Pope Gelasius I, 492—496, broke all usage by not sending a letter of notification of his accession to the papacy to Euphemius, Patriarch of Constantinople. In 493 he wrote to the Oriental bishops that to Rome appeals lay open from all Christendom "by canon law," whereas no appeal from Rome was recognized, but he does not venture to name the canons which invested Rome with such unbounded power.

Pope Gelasius said it became kings to learn their duty especially from the "Vicar of the blessed Peter," and that to the See of Rome belonged the primacy, in virtue of Christ's own delegation, and that from the authority of the keys there was excepted none living, but only the dead. The council replied, "In thee we behold Christ's Vicar."

He also said, "As the moon receives her light from the sun, so the king receives his brilliancy from the Pope." He had a Roman Synod of 70 bishops declare Matt. 16, 18 the sole ground of the Roman Primacy, apart from any synodal

law or constitution whatever. On this followed his epistle to the Illyrians, wherein he claims that the Pope is the Universal Bishop and as such has all powers ever claimed by Gregory VII and Innocent III. Even the Vatican Decrees of 1870 add almost nothing to these papal claims of the fifth century.

After a speech by Pope Gelasius, in 495, the bishops and priests in the synod rose up and cried fifteen times, "O Christ, hear us! Long life to Gelasius!" and twelve times they cried, "Lord Peter, preserve him!" and seven times they cried, "May he hold the see of Peter during the years of Peter!" and six times they cried, "We see thee, who art the Vicar of Christ!" and again they cried thirty-seven times, "May he hold the see of Peter during the years of Peter!" Such was the spirit which the Popes of the latter part of the fifth century had managed to infuse into the bishops whom they consecrated and ruled. (Puller, 281.)

In 496 Gelasius approved in very positive terms the judicial supremacy of the Bishop of Rome.

In 500 a synod of bishops in Asia Minor forbade the "Acta Pauli." The first papal Index of prohibited books was issued by Gelasius I in 494.

In 496 Clovis, king of the Franks, in fulfillment of a vow made on the field of Tolbiac, where he was victorious over the Allemanni, was baptized at Rheims and was called the "Eldest Son of the Church," the title of the kings of France for 1400 years. With the aid of the Roman Christians, Clovis conquered the Arian princes of the western Goths, Burgundians, and Bavarians. He and his successors gave the Church much property, acquiesced in the papal claims, and helped to extend the papal power throughout the West, though they ruled the clergy as their vassals.

In 501 Theodoric called the Synodus Palmaris of 115 Italian bishops to try Pope Symmachus, who, after a riot, retracted his consent to the jurisdiction of the synod. The synod declined to try the Pope on the grounds, "that the

Pope, as God's Vicar, was the judge of all, and could himself be judged by no one," and acquitted him—Synod of the Incongruous Acquittal. Ennodius alleged that the Pope can be tried only by his own consent, because of his "hereditary innocence." This bold claim was embodied in the acts of the synod; it was revived by Gregory VII.

On the accession of Pope Hormisdas, Emperor Anastasius convened a Synod at Heraclea, in July, 515, and the Pope sent legates instructed to raise the prestige of Rome rather than heal the divisions of Christendom. The Pope's demands were too great, and the synod came to naught. The Pope excommunicated Dorotheus of Thessalonica, Eparch of Eastern Illyricum, a papal vicar, and thus took a step in advance of any aggression on local rights yet essayed by Rome. On the death of Emperor Anastasius, in 518, and the accession of Justin I, unable to read or write, the Formulary of Hormisdas was signed, and thus Constantinople submitted to Rome's demands. The price of Justin's help was the Pope's promised help against Theodoric!

In March, 532, Emperor Justinian acknowledges the supremacy of Rome and commands all churches to be united to her. About this time the bishop became an imperial officer—he inspected the public accounts every year, and all bequests and trusts were under him. The emperor states he had been very diligent in subjecting all the clergy of the East to the Roman bishop. Pope John II complimented him on his "perfect acquaintance with ecclesiastical law and discipline," and added, "Preserving the reverence due the Roman See, you have subjected all things unto her, and reduced all churches to that unity which dwelleth in her alone, to whom the Lord, through the Prince of the Apostles, did relegate all power; . . . and that the Apostolic See is in verity the head of all churches both the rules of the fathers and the statutes of the princes do manifestly declare, and the same is now witnessed by your imperial piety."

Pope Agapetus, in 535, treated the usage of his own see

as being the laws of the Universal Church, though the conciliar authority is almost wholly against him.

He made war on King Theodahat, subdued Dalmatia and Sicily. When the king sent the Pope on an embassy to Constantinople, the Pope had to pawn the church-plate to raise money for the trip, successive simoniacal Popes having squandered the church property for electioneering expenses.

About 550 the monk Dionysius Exiguus collected the canons of the general councils and of the chief provincial councils and embodied the decretal epistles from Pope Sircius down. This collection became the standard of church law in the West and did much to raise the papal power, since their letters were seemingly on a level with the decrees of the most venerated councils.

When Emperor Augustulus was deposed, in 476, the division of the Eastern and Western empires ended. In the following century the Goths were put down by Justinian's generals, Belisarius and Narses, and Italy was subject to the emperor at Constantinople and ruled by his exarchs at Ravenna, who compelled the people to sell even their children in order to pay their taxes, and made no real resistance to the incoming Lombards. As a bishop and as a great landowner of thousands of square miles, with millions of revenue, Gregory the Great took it on himself to make peace with the Lombards, and thus paved the way for the great political power exerted by his successors and for the temporal sovereignty they acquired.

The patrimony of St. Peter included estates in Italy and the near islands and also in Gaul, Illyria, Dalmatia, Africa, and even Asia. By his real estate agents Gregory carried on his communications with other churches and sovereigns and thus extended Rome's influence. In some cases he appointed bishops as his vicars and conferred on them the pall as the mark of this power. This pall was originally a part of the imperial dress and was at first bestowed by the Eastern emperors on Patriarchs of Constantinople. Later on Popes gave

it to their vicars. Later they were sold for enormous sums, and thus floods of money rolled into the Pope's treasury from all parts of the world.

During one generation Mainz paid seven times 25,000 Gulden for the pall; there were about fifty other bishopries in Germany, besides the abbacies. (Gebhardt, *Gravamina*, p. 85.)

By his connection with the Frankish princes of Gaul, Gregory gained support for his church independently of the emperor at Constantinople. By sending Augustine to England, in 596, Gregory extended his influence over the Church of England. By his influence over Queen Theodelinda of the Lombards, Gregory overcame their Arianism and brought them to the orthodox faith.

Boniface, the Apostle of Germany, induced all German and Frank bishops to vow implicit obedience to the Bishop of Rome. After this no metropolitan went into office without the pallium from Rome authorizing him to do so.

Gregory paid frequent compliments to the Frankish Queen Brunichild or Brunehaut, a very strange object for papal praises. He was also very subservient to the Emperor Phocas, who had murdered Emperor Maurice, his wife Constantina, their five sons, and three daughters. Gregory wrote the usurping murderer: "God Almighty has elected Your Majesty and placed it on the imperial throne." He hopes the emperor will be rewarded in heaven for freeing his subjects from the load under which they had sighed. (Schick, 75.)

Mommsen calls Gregory a "very little great man."

When John the Faster, Patriarch of Constantinople, called himself "Universal Bishop," as others had done before him, Gregory I of Rome, as Pelagius II before him, wrote twelve letters to Emperor Maurice and others and called that title a "name of blasphemy, by which the honor of all bishops is taken away, while it is madly assumed by one man for himself." (Migne's ed., vol. 3, sec. 749.) Again (vol. 7, 13, sec. 881): "Whoever calls himself . . . Universal Bishop, in

his presumption is a forerunner of Antichrist. . . . And the pride by which he is led to this error is very similar (to that of Antichrist), for as the latter in his perversity wishes to seem placed over all men as God, so, whoever the former is who desires to be called the only bishop, exalts himself above the rest of the bishops." (*Our Brief*, pp. 40, 41; B. Willard-Archer, 251.)

In 593 Gregory I wrote Emperor Maurice I in clear disapproval of a law, but promising obedience to the law as a subject of the emperor. He acknowledged the emperor as his "earthly master," and said that God had given the ruler dominion even over the priesthood. (Bk. 2, letters 62, 65; Bk. 3, letter 65; Bk. 6, letter 2.—Flick, 298; Hauck, *Der Gedanke*, 1.)

The mass gradually became a real propitiatory sacrifice, the powerful, mysterious center of all worship, which became imposing, dramatic, theatrical. Festivals became almost numberless; saints also; a "calendar of saints" had to be formed. Pilgrimages and the use of reliques developed such a craze that councils, Popes, and the emperor sought to check it. Religious pageants were multiplied, and the use of images and the pictures of saints were encouraged in the churches. The Virgin Mary was exalted to divinity. St. Chrysostom rebukes the bishops who "had fallen to the condition of land-stewards, hucksters, brokers, publicans, and pay-clerks."

Pope Boniface III congratulated Phocas and recognized the murderous usurper as the lawful ruler, and for this favor Phocas recognized the Bishop of Rome as the "Universal Bishop" and forbade the Patriarch of Constantinople to use that title. Anastasius the Librarian says, "Boniface III it was who obtained from the Emperor Phocas that the Roman Church should be head of all churches."

From now on the Popes began to use the formula, "We will and command," when ratifying elections of bishops. (Littledale, *P. R.*, 241.)

"Although we all know how Christ trusted Peter with the keys (on the strength of which fact you claim I know not what proud privileges of authority over others)," etc. (Columbanus to Boniface IV, 608—615, in *Program of Modernism*, 10. Putnams, 1908.)

When Mahomet arose, the Eastern emperors had troubles of their own and could not trouble about Italy, and so the Pope had to guard that country against the Lombards, and the Romans looked more and more to their powerful bishops as their rulers rather than to the distant and helpless emperors.

Pope Martin I, 649—654, could venture to incense his sovereign by ignoring the imperial right of confirming his election.

Gregory III, 731—741, was threatened by the Lombard Liutprand and sought—the last time—confirmation of his election from the emperor, but in the same year the Pope led a political revolt against his legitimate sovereign and appealed for help to Charles Martel; but he did not help, for Liutprand had given aid against the Arabs in 732. But Martel helped Boniface in his mission in Hesse, Thuringia, and Bavaria, and Christianized the Frisians by force. In 739 Gregory III sent Martel the keys of St. Peter's grave, with the offer of sovereignty of Rome and Italy in return for aid against the Lombards; but Charles refused.

At the election of Pope Zacharias the reference to the emperor or to the exarch for approval of the election was for the first time omitted—a serious change.

As the price for the Pope's help, King Liutprand of Lombardy "gave back" to Pope Zachary, 741—752, four cities in Tuscany, and the Pope accepted this "donation," though the property of the Emperor of Constantinople. This is the first time that the Pope is recognized as a political ruler. With the approval of Pope Zacharias, Pepin, in 752, dethroned the lawful King of France, Childeric III, and soon after was crowned by Pope Stephen II. This act of Zacharias was used

by Gregory VII, Innocent III, and Boniface VIII as justification for their claims to the right to depose sovereigns.

"By the grace of God" Pepin styled himself; the first time these words were used as to a king's crown; hitherto it had referred only to bishops. Since the kings of Judah and Israel no ruler's head had been touched with the anointing oil; Boniface, the Pope's legate, anointed the King of the Franks.

In 751 King Aistulph of the Lombards drove Eutychus, the Exarch of Ravenna, to Constantinople, and demanded submission of Rome as part of the conquered province. Having troubles of his own with the Saracens, Emperor Constantine at Constantinople could not help Pope Stephen. The Pope appealed to the Virgin Mary, Peter, Paul, and other saints, carrying their images in solemn procession; but in vain. The Pope then wrote a letter in the name of the Apostle St. Peter, and sent it to Pepin, King of France, calling on him to come to the defense of the Pope and the city of Rome against the Lombards. He even crossed the Alps in winter to beg the protection of the King of Ponthieu. Pepin led the Pope's palfrey, promised protection and also the territory to be won from the Lombards, to take the title of Patrician of Rome and therewith the position of protector to the Pope. Stephen III anointed Pepin again.

Pepin overthrew Aistulph and gave the exarchate of Ravenna to the Pope. When the envoys came to demand the land for the emperor at Constantinople, the rightful owner, Pepin coolly replied, he had made war on the Lombards not to please men, but for the forgiveness of sins and love of St. Peter. The Pope now had the exarchate of Ravenna, "with all the cities, castles, and territories thereto belonging, to be forever held and possessed by the most holy Pope Stephen and his successors in the apostolic see of St. Peter." This "donation" of Pepin in 755 tightened the Pope's grip on the temporal power. Fleury calls this "an artifice without parallel before or since in church history."

The Pope received his *miter* as Universal Bishop from the usurper Phocas; he now received his *crown* as a temporal sovereign from the usurper Pepin!

In 720 Ina, King of Wessex, visited Rome and promised a penny a year from every householder in his kingdom to maintain an English school in Rome. This Peter's pence was extended to Mercia by King Offa in 792. In 870 Ethelwulf, King of Wessex, and his son Alfred the Great, on a visit to Rome confirmed the gift of Peter's pence and promised other annual payments.

In time the Popes demanded the Peter's pence as a right. It was discontinued under Edward I and Edward II and abolished under Henry VIII.

"The last Peter's pence sent by England amounted to forty thousand pounds sterling." (Father Keenan, in *Grafton's Correspondence*, p. 15.)

The Paris Council of 829 and Letter 133 of Ivo of Chartres complain of the great sums that had to be paid the Pope by bishops and abbots ordained in Rome. Since the ninth century all metropolitans had to get the pall from Rome, and the price grew so great that in 1027 King Canute tried to get a reduction for the English bishops. (*R. E. I*, 93.)

The Synod of Elvira, before 316, forbade images in churches, but after fierce struggles Rome conquered at the second council at Nicaea in 787; images were worshiped, Thomas Aquinas going so far as to declare that the image of Christ is to be worshiped the same as Christ Himself. (III. Sent., dist. 9, qu. 1, art. 2. Summa III, qu. 25, art. 3. 4. *R. E.*, vol. 3, 226.)

For political reasons King Offa of Mercia requested Pope Adrian I, 787, to transform Lichfield into an archbishopric in opposition to Canterbury. For a money consideration, and to increase Rome's power, Pope Adrian trampled on the rights and liberties of the English Church in the face of her earnest but helpless protests. Pope Leo III, in 803, confessed the partition of Canterbury unjust and abolished the archbish-

opric of Lichfield, on the protests of the English bishops.
(*Angl. Br.*, 154.)

When the Lombards again besieged Rome, the Pope called Charles the Great, who defeated them, visited the Pope, kissed the steps of St. Peter as he ascended, and ratified and enlarged the gift of his father Pepin. A third time was the King of France called, and for his aid he was crowned by Pope Leo III on Christmas Eve, 800, as Emperor of the Western Empire. Formerly the Popes were confirmed by the emperors; now the Pope had crowns to give away!

The Chronicle of Moissac tells us at his coronation Emperor Charles "was adored by the Pope after the manner of the emperors of old." Charles exercised jurisdiction over the Pope. An interesting instance of this jurisdiction was the veto of Austria, at the instance of Emperor William II, of the election of Cardinal Rampolla; as a result Pope Pius X was elected. This right of veto was abolished by a papal bull dated June 20, 1904, but only recently promulgated, in "*Acta Pii X*," vol. 3. (*Literary Digest*, April 17, 1909.)

In order to give to the Popes a show of right to these lands, the "Donation of Constantine" was forged at Rome in 753. According to this document Emperor Constantine gave to "Blessed Sylvester" and his successors, to the end of time, the Lateran palace, crown, miter, escort, couriers, and horsemen; in short, all the retinue or courtly luster of an empire. It also confers on Blessed Father Sylvester and his successors the city of Rome, all Italy, and the provinces, places, and cities of the western region with jurisdiction over Antioch, Alexandria, Constantinople, and Jerusalem. The reason for this "donation" of Constantine is: "It is not right that the earthly emperor have power where the Prince of Priests and Head of the Christian Religion has been installed by the Heavenly Emperor." Here we have it expressed for the first time that the Roman bishop is independent of the secular power.

This "donation" was supposed to have been made when

Constantinople was built, that is to say, from 328 to 330. But the first writer to distinctly mention the "donation" is Bishop Aeneas of Paris, about 868, and the earliest Greek writer showing knowledge of it is the canonist Balsamon, who died in 1180.

As early as the time of Otto III, his chancellor, Leo of Vercelli, denounced this "donation" as a forgery; so did Arnold of Brescia, in 1152; so did Nikolaus von Kues, in 1432; so did Laurentius, in 1440, and Reginald Pecock, in 1450, and Cardinal Baronius, in 1592. Now most Catholic historians admit the forgery. (*Realencyc.*; Robertson, *Growth*, 157.)

As the Pope's political power was founded on fraud, so his spiritual power was based on forgery. To the pseudo-Clementines, of about 200, were added the Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals in the first half of the ninth century.

The Roman abbot Dionysius Exiguus, who died in 556, gathered the decrees of the general councils as the law for the whole Church, but he wove into them the papal decretals from Siricius, 384, to Anastasius, 498. One of the completest editions was known as that of Bishop Isidore of Seville, † 636. In the first half of the ninth century there suddenly appeared another collection under the name of this Isidore.

"Isidor Mercator" forged fifty-nine letters and decretals of the twenty oldest Popes, from Clement I to Melechiades, and the Donation of Constantine, and thirty-nine false decrees, and the acts of several unauthentic councils, from Sylvester, 314, to Gregory II, 731, and attributed them to Isidore of Seville, hence called Pseudo-Isidorian Decretals. Pope Nicholas I seems to be ignorant of them in 859 and to know them well in 860, and he used them against the Gallic Church and the Greek Patriarch Photius. He even lied they had been in the Roman archives from the beginning.

This is the greatest literary forgery in the history of the world. Here we read that Christ made Peter the ruler over

the others, and that the Roman bishop has the rule over the whole Church. Disobedience to the Pope is disobedience to Christ Himself; clerics and laics, people and princes, must obey him in all spiritual matters. And the Pope's rules were placed alongside of God's commandments, and therefore the emperor had to obey them also.

Pope Gregory VII based his far-reaching claims on these forgeries. Thomas Aquinas, Bellarmine, and others were misled by these spurious documents, and the whole fabric of the Canon Law is reared on this rotten foundation. Gratian's "Decretum" of 1151 quotes 324 times epistles of the Popes of the first four centuries, and of these 313 are from letters now known to be spurious. (Robertson, *Growth*, 158—165.)

By this forgery the papal powers were increased so as to remind one of the universal bishopric proclaimed by the Vatican Council in 1870. According to this forgery the Pope is subject to no one, is under no human jurisdiction, and his decrees are binding, and the emperor may not do anything against the Pope's laws.

Hincmar of Rheims at once showed their falsity, called them a honeyed poison cup, and gained the ill-will of the Pope; Cardinal Baronius spoke with indignation of the fraud; Cardinal Fleury in the 17th century also proves them to be forgeries; the Romanist Scherer says: "He that knowingly lies and forges as does Pseudo-Isidore gives up all claim to the title of an honest man;" the Jesuit Father de Regnon of Paris confesses, in 1865, that "the impostor really gained his end, and altered the discipline of the Church, as he desired, but did not hinder the universal decay. God blesses no fraud; the false decretals have done nothing but mischief." Cardinal Bellarmine admits the forgery, nay, Pope Pius VI in 1789 said, "Let us put aside this collection, to be burned with fire." Baronius falsified the Roman Martyrology so as to make Rome appear as the mother of various churches. (Janus, 397—402; E. Seckel, *Realencyc.*; Littledale, 120—125.)

Father Franz Wenzeslaus Barkovich says: "The decretals are full of principles hitherto new in the Church of Jesus

Christ." An Italian memoir says: "In these decretals they teach a doctrine different from the Gospel and the Church Fathers."

John Nicholas of Hontheim, Bishop of Treves, says: "That bishops derive their power from the Pope is an invention of the thirteenth century."

Antonio Pereira of Lisbon says the Roman doctrine was introduced by these false decretals of Isidore in the ninth century and by Gratian's *Decretum* in the twelfth century. (Schick, 86—89.)

Father Gratry writes: "I have before me a Roman Breviary of 1520, printed at Turin, in which, on the feast of St. Leo, June 28th, I find the condemnation of Honorius. . . . I open the Roman Breviary of to-day. . . . The trifling incident of a Pope condemned for heresy by an Ecumenical Council is simply omitted by the revisers of the Breviary in the sixteenth century. Father Garnier, in his edition of the 'Liber Diurnus,' says, with a gentle irony, that they omitted it for the sake of brevity." (Gore, *R. C. C.*, p. 112.)

Pope Urban IV sent to Aquinas a chain of forged passages from the Greek Councils and Fathers, and from these forgeries, made in 1261 by a Dominican monk, Aquinas built up the papal system, 1. that the Pope is the first infallible teacher of the world, and 2. the absolute ruler of the Church, and introduced it into dogmatic theology.

Pope John XXII in his delight uttered his famous saying that Thomas had worked as many miracles as he had written articles, and in his Bull, that Thomas had not written without a special inspiration of the Holy Ghost. (Janus, 261—271.)

Liguori and others quote Irenaeus as saying: "It is necessary that all should depend on the Church of Rome, as on a well-spring or fount." No such passage exists; it is a pure forgery. (Littledale, *P. R.*, 126.)

The Romanists quote Cyprian as acknowledging the Pope to be the Universal Bishop. But Archbishop Benson of Can-

terbury in his "Life of Cyprian" proves the words on which the papalists base their claims to be deliberate forgeries. He says: "Papal apologists have steadily maintained the grossest forgeries in literature." "There never was a viler fraud—never one so easy of detection—embodied for the first time in 1563, after all earlier editions and reprints had escaped them." The editor Latini resigned rather than have his name linked with an edition which the theologians of the Vatican tampered with. (E. G. Man, pp. 210, 211; Bartoli, 89—94.)

Littledale says this impudent forgery was introduced by Pope Pelagius II in a letter to the bishops of Istria; that Baluze's note, giving the facts of the forgery, stands in the Benedictine edition, which was falsified after his death while he was busy on it; that this forgery is still inserted in the Roman edition of Cyprian's works and still quoted by Ultramontanes. (P. R., 126; Bartoli, Preface, XIII.)

Another forgery in favor of Rome is found in the formula of Pope Hormisdas presented for signature to the Oriental bishops in the Acacian schism, interpolated into the Acts of the Eighth Council. Also five documents to show that the Fathers of Nicaea asked for the approval and ratification of their Canons and Acts by Pope Sylvester. "The Roman Church has always had the primacy," has been interpolated into the *Prisca*, the ancient Latin translation of the Nicene Canons.

"The First See may not be judged by any one," is a spurious canon of the pretended Synod of Sinuessa, held there in 303. The Decretum Gelasii, strongly favoring the primacy of the Roman See, is false. (Bartoli, 104—119.)

Cardinal Manning allowed that the early Church tradition was "untrustworthy," and urged the Pope to have a fair edition made. (*Diary*, Nice, Dec. 9, 1883.)

Rufinus admits that he has "so smoothed and corrected" the translation from the Greek that a Latin reader would meet "with nothing" which would appear "discordant with our belief." Jerome refused this translation and made another. Socrates says of Eusebius: "This author was evidently more

intent on a highly wrought eulogium of the emperor than an accurate statement of facts." (E. G. Man, 200—203.)

In 1232 the Greek Patriarch Germanus wrote to the cardinals: "Your tyrannical oppression and the extortions of the Roman Church are the cause of our disunion."

Humbert, General of the Dominicans, in 1274 drew up a memorial for the Council of Lyons: "The Roman Church knows only how to make the yoke she has laid on men's shoulders press heavily; her extortions, her numberless legates and nuncios, and the multitude of her statutes and punishments, have deterred the Greeks from reunion."

Sir John Mandeville, on his return from the East, related that the Greeks had answered laconically to Pope John XXII's demand for submission: "Thy plenary power over thy subjects we firmly believe; thine immeasurable pride we cannot endure, and thy greed we cannot satisfy. With thee is Satan, with us the Lord."

"All these canons are apocryphal," shortly and dryly replied the Greeks to the passages from pseudo-Isidore and Gratian at Florence. (Janus, 321—323.)

Many writings of the Fathers were interpolated; others were unknown, and spurious matter was accepted in their place. Books bearing venerable names—Clement, Dionysius, Isidore—were forged for the purpose of supplying authorities for opinions that lacked the sanction of antiquity.

When it was discovered in the manuscript of the *Liber Diurnus* that the Popes had for centuries condemned Pope Honorius in their profession of faith, Cardinal Bona, the most eminent man in Rome, advised that the book should be suppressed if the difficulty could not be got over; and it was suppressed accordingly. (Acton, *Hist. Freedom*, 513. 516.)

About 1700 Antonio Pereira says the Romans falsified the Missal and calls it "Rome's custom known to the world." (Schick, 107.)

Father Gratry also writes: "Are we the preachers of falsehood or the apostles of truth? . . . Has not the time arrived to

reject with disgust the frauds, the interpolations, and mutilations which liars and forgers, our most cruel enemies, have been able to introduce amongst us? . . . I myself was long before I could believe in this apologetic of ignorance, blindness, and half-honesty, or rather dishonesty . . . which has recourse to deceit, to mystery, to force, to falsehood, to a fraudulent invention of forged passages. Once more, Has God need of these frauds? . . . O ye men of little faith, of low minds, of miserable hearts, have not your cunning devices become the scandal of souls?" (Bp. Gore, *R. C. C.*, 112.)

Pope Leo XIII in his Encyclical Letter "Satis Cognitum" of 1896, makes 1. arbitrary assumptions; 2. wholly unhistorical assertions; 3. unjustifiable quotations. (a) He quotes St. Pacian as saying, "To Peter the Lord spake; to one therefore, that He might establish unity upon one." But the Pope omits to mention that St. Pacian continues, "And soon He was to give the same injunction to the general body." (b) He cites, in confirmation of the papal view of Peter as the rock, some quite ambiguous words of Origen, although the context proves conclusively that Origen had no idea that Peter had any privilege which all the other Apostles did not share. (c) He cites St. Cyprian as saying "of the Roman Church that 'It is the root and mother of the Catholic Church, the Chair of St. Peter, and the principal Church whence sacerdotal unity had its origin.'" This is a combination of two different passages, of which the first, "the root and mother of the Catholic Church," has no reference to the Roman Church, and the second, from a letter strongly rebuking the Pope, refers to Rome as the source of the apostolical succession in Africa. (Bp. Gore, *R. C. C.*, 199.)

It was the oft-repeated reproach of the Greeks that the Roman Church was "the native home of inventions and falsification of documents." Janus says, "Like successive strata of the earth covering one another, so layer after layer of forgeries and falsifications was piled up in the Church." (p. 117.)

Milwaukee, Wis.

W. DALLMANN.

STATUS OF THE ENGLISH WORK OF THE GERMAN MISSOURI SYNOD.

In the July issue of 1909 we attempted for the first time to estimate the size and extent of the Missouri Synod's English work. The difficulties attending the preparation of the estimate at that time still exist. The returns made by the pastors reporting for the *Year-Book* for 1909 are incomplete, and the terms in which the nature of the English work performed in certain places is described carry some latitude of meaning. Accordingly, the totals in the tables following are subject to question. But the entire estimate proceeds on just as conservative lines as that of the previous year. The system of groups adopted for last year's estimate, also the nomenclature of the various divisions, has been followed in the present estimate. Division 4 in Group B, Division 15 in Group C, and Division 23 in Group D have been dropped, partly because there was no entry for them, and partly because they could be conveniently combined with other divisions with which they were nearly identical. It is necessary to state that the Colored Missions which are reported in the *Year-Book* are not included in this estimate, because they are not carried on by the German Missouri Synod exclusively, nor do they affect the English movement in the German body, hence could not be used as evidence to show a tendency toward, or away from, the use of English in our German congregations.—If any of our readers should discover mistakes in the tables submitted, we shall be glad to be told, and make the necessary corrections.

At the close of 1909, English preaching was reported within the bounds of the German Missouri Synod from 444 places, as follows:—

Western District	62 (plus 7)
Central District	56 (plus 4)
Minnesota and Dakota District	36 (plus 7)
Eastern District	31 (plus 4)
Michigan District	30 (plus 2)
Iowa District	27 (plus 9)
Kansas District	27 (plus 4)

Atlantic District	21	(plus 3)
Wisconsin District	21	(plus 4)
Northern Illinois District	20	(plus 8)
Central Illinois District	19	(minus 5)
Nebraska District	17	(plus 5)
Texas District	16	(plus 5)
Oregon and Washington District	14	(plus 6)
Southern Illinois District	14	(minus 1)
Southern District	11	(plus 1)
South Dakota District	9	(plus 2)
Canada District	8	(minus 1)
California and Nevada District	5	(plus 1)

Total..... 444 (plus 65)

Dividing these places into groups like last year, we obtain the following results:—

GROUP A.

1. Entirely English congregations and missions.....	35	(minus 2)
2. Almost entirely English congregations.....	3	(unchanged)
3. Congregations in which English predominates.....	6	(plus 1)

Total..... 44 (minus 1)

GROUP B.

4. German-English congregations (also English-German)	41	(plus 17)
5. German and English congregations.....	5	(unchanged)
6. Congregations in which English and German preaching alternates	5	(minus 3)
7. Congregations in which there is English preaching every Sunday	23	(minus 3)

Total..... 74 (plus 9)

GROUP C.

8. Congregations which have established regular English services ("regelmaessig")	87	(plus 4)
9. Congregations which conduct also English services ("auch englisch")	40	(plus 18)
10. Congregations which have three English services a month	2	(plus 1)
11. Congregations which have English service every other week	27	(plus 18)
12. Congregations which have English preaching twice a month	33	(unchanged)
13. Congregations which have English preaching every third Sunday (also once in three weeks).....	5	(plus 1)
14. Congregations which have English preaching every four weeks	7	(plus 6)
15. Congregations which have English services once a month	108	(plus 11)

Total..... 309 (plus 50)

GROUP D.

16. Congregations which have one English service in six weeks	2 (plus 1)
17. Congregations which have English services once every other month	1 (unchanged)
18. Congregations which have English preaching three times a month during summer.....	1 (unchanged)
19. Congregations which have English services frequently ("oefters")	2 (plus 1)
20. Congregations which have English preaching occasionally ("zuweilen" and "gelegentlich")	10 (plus 3)

Total..... 17 (plus 5)

Group A, Division 1, embraces thirteen organized congregations, as follows: Los Angeles, Cal.; Rust, Mich.; Wawaka, Ind.; Creston, Nebr.; Chicago, Ill. (Rev. Schuessler's and Bethany); Portland, Oreg.; Kennewick, Wash.; Henderson Tp., Pa.; New Orleans, La. (Rev. Kuss's); Dallas, Tex.; Racine, Wis.; Milwaukee, Wis. The remainder in this division are missions. The membership at the 35 places in this division totals 4068 souls and 2426 communicant members.

Division 2 in this group embraces three congregations (Arcadia, Ind.; New Orleans, La.—Rev. Wambsganss's; Hannibal, Mo.), with a membership of 1365 souls and 799 communicants.

In Division 3 we have Zanesville, Lancaster, Logan, O.; Richmond, Va.; New Orleans, La. (Rev. Von der Au's), and St. Louis, Mo.—six congregations, with 2791 souls and 1836 communicant members.

The total membership in Group A is 8224 souls and 5061 communicants.

It is impossible to figure the English element in the remaining groups, because that is merged in the German census.

In tabulated form the status of the English work of the German Missouri Synod, by Districts, Groups and Divisions, presents the following aspects:—

An English element may also be recognized in congregations which conduct a Sunday school. Quite a number of pastors reporting Sunday schools specify that their Sunday school is English, others, that German and English is used in their Sunday school, while still others report the mere fact that there is a Sunday school in their congregations. We may safely take the existence of a Sunday school as presumptive evidence that English services are conducted at that place. The *Year-Book* reports 420 Sunday schools. Of these 303 also state their membership, which totals 17,606 pupils. Of the congregations and missions reporting Sunday schools, only those are included in the above tables which have definitely stated that they conduct English preaching. There are not many that have reported both facts.

TP PF
11

BOOK REVIEW.

HAUPT-SACHREGISTER, SPRUCHREGISTER, BERICHTIGUNGEN
UND NACHTRÄGE ZU SÄEMTLICHEN BAENDEN DER
ST. LOUISER AUSGABE VON LUTHERS WERKEN. St.
Louis, Mo. Concordia Publ. House. 1910. VII pages
and 2203 columns. Price: Sheep Binding, \$5.00; Law
Buckram, \$4.25.

The concluding volume (XXIII) of the St. Louis edition of Luther's works will go by the name of the "Index Volum." But to merely call it that seems hardly to do justice to the immense amount of honest, scholarly, efficient work that has been crowded into its more than one thousand pages. First comes the Index proper, col. 1--2132. There are indexes and indexes. Some are mere fragmentary hints, couched in the diction of a telegram, immensely brief, obscure, and perplexing. Others are undigested contrivances which register the contents of a book in a mechanical way, without an effort to judiciously arrange homogeneous matters. The compilation of an index seems a very easy matter, but to produce a good, working index is a very arduous task. Especially an index of Luther's Works. It requires good, discriminating judgment, which knows both how to divide and to combine, readily perceives the various bearings which a certain remark of the Reformer has, and strives, if possible, to

make the reference speak Luther's language. The volume before us is much more than a dry list of words in alphabetical order, flanked by an array of still more dry references to volumes and pages: it is almost a collection of excerpts, topically arranged, and not only indicates where certain information may be obtained, but furnishes a part of the information itself. The busy scholar will appreciate this feature greatly. As a test of the value of this Index we would suggest the perusal of the copious references given under two or three of the following terms: "Busse," "Christus," "Gerechtigkeit," "Glaube," "Kirche," "Luther," "Papst," "Predigt," "Suende," "Werke," "Wort Gottes." These articles are a revelation not only as regards the wealth of information contained in the twenty-two volumes of the Luther edition published by the Missouri Synod, but also as regards the patient work of research, collation, and grouping performed by the editor, Prof. A. F. Hoppe, in the preparation of this volume. Nor has he selected only the important matters and leading ideas in Luther's many treatises for registration, but also brief references to comparatively trivial matters have found their place in this Index, as can be seen from such titles as "Abeloniten," "Agtstein," "ausgehen," "Baerwolf," etc. The letter A alone in this Index contains 276 titles. In a few places it has seemed to us that a separate title would not have been necessary, *e. g.*, "Beichtender, Ein" (comp. "beichten"), "menschlich," "Ostertag" (comp. "Osterfest," "Ostern").—The Index contains all references to historical events, personages, places, etc., which occur in Luther's Works.

Next comes an Index of Passages which have been explained in Luther's writings. This Index is intended to supplement similar indexes in vols. 2, 12, and 13. It is very prolix; for Romans alone it contains nearly 400 references. It fills 29 columns of small print.

The next division is of the very highest value to the student of Luther's Works: it contains emendations and supplements to the 22 volumes of the St. Louis edition. In this section the critical skill of the lifelong student of Luther is in evidence. And to what extent the previous volumes have gained in exactness through this part of Prof. Hoppe's work, can be surmised when we note that for vol. X alone 330 emendations are offered. This division embraces 40 columns.

At the end of the volume there is a device by which the odd and often perplexing dates which Luther employs in his writings can be reduced to our modern calendar.

In every sense the old adage, "*Finis coronat opus,*" applies to this Index Volume. It is the master-key to a vast storehouse of Christian, Biblical information. It will stimulate afresh the study

of Luther's writings, because it renders such study greatly less tiresome, especially topical study, and it will make all who do not possess the St. Louis Luther feel very keenly the need of this edition.

BEITRAEGE ZUR PRAKTISEN BEHANDLUNG DER BIBLISCHEN
GESCHICHTE. Neues Testament. Von W. Wegener.
St. Louis, Mo. Concordia Publishing House. 1910.
VI and 298 pages. Price, \$1.00, postpaid.

This book exhibits the author's method of teaching Bible stories. He regards four points as essential. First, the heading of the story. This is to be firmly fixed in the child's mind as a distinctive mark by which the child is enabled to recognize particular stories and to refer to them later. Secondly, the introduction. This is to prepare the way for the intelligent comprehension of the story by the child. Thirdly, the recitation of the story by the teacher. Lastly, the catechetical review of the story. The author discusses this method at greater length in the introduction. The body of the book is taken up by 73 stories from the New Testament. The text-book issued by the Missouri Synod for intermediate classes of graded parochial schools is taken as a basis. For these stories the author offers the requisite introductory material, and the recitation by the teacher. The catechetical review of the stories is not given. The book is in no way a *pons asinorum*. It is a good pedagogical guide to the impartation of this branch of religious knowledge, and ought to stimulate the teacher to personal efforts of his own. The stories treated in this book are made very interesting by the illuminating remarks suggested to the teacher in the Introduction and in the Recitation; and he is shown how to facilitate the child's study of the stories by happy divisions of the story into suitable parts.

Concordia Publishing House announces the following brochures:

1. *Katalog der Lehranstalten.* A summary of the year's work (1909/10) in the ten institutions of higher education conducted by the Missouri Synod, with roster of teachers and students.

2. *Doctrine of the Trinity as exhibited in the Old Testament.* Conclusion of a doctrinal paper submitted by Prof. Pardieck to the Western District of the Missouri Synod. 25 pages. Price, 12 cts.

3. *Transactions of the Brazil District* of the Missouri Synod at its convention in 1909 at Santa Cruz, Rio Grande do Sul. 32 pages. Price, 8 cts.

4. *The Assurance of Salvation.* Conclusion of a doctrinal paper

submitted by *Rev. W. Luessenhop* to the Oregon and Washington District of the Missouri Synod. 21 pages. Price, 10 cts.

5. *Blemishes in the Corinthian Congregation, with Paul's Directions How to Remove and Overcome them*—a lesson for our congregations. A doctrinal paper submitted by *Rev. Alb. H. Brauer* to the Northern Illinois District of the Missouri Synod. 42 pages. Price, 17 cts.

6. *The Book of the Prophet Jonah*. A doctrinal paper submitted by *Rev. H. Speckhard* to the Michigan District of the Missouri Synod. 58 pages. Price, 15 cts.

7. *Luther's Morals*. By *Rev. J. H. Hartenberger*. This is a reprint from the last issue of the THEOLOGICAL QUARTERLY, which makes it easy for our ministers and laymen to reply to current charges of the viler element in Romanism. Price, 10 cts.

COUNTRY SERMONS. *New Series*. Vol. V: Sermons on Free Texts for the Entire Church Year. By *Rev. F. Kuegele*. New Edition, Revised and Enlarged. Augusta Publishing Co. Crimora, Va. 1910. XII and 640 pages. Price, \$2.25.

Thirteen years ago it was the reviewer's privilege to announce the second volume of the series of *Country Sermons* to the readers of the *Lutheran Witness* (vol. XV, p. 119). The entire series is now before us in one solid volume. A few changes have been made; *e. g.*, the thirteen funeral sermons appended to vol. 2 of the first edition have been dropped, and six new sermons (II. and VI. after Epiph., XXVI. and XXVII. after Trin., Mission Festival and Thanksgiving Day) have been added, and the pruning and correcting hand of the author is in evidence here and there throughout the volume. But all these changes merely serve to enhance the value of the book, and the high regard expressed for its merits at the time of its first appearance must be repeated now that the aged author probably issues his work for the last time *manu propria*. "Pastor Kuegele's sermons all betray careful, searching study of his text with its context and parallels. They likewise evince an intimate pastoral knowledge of the needs of an Evangelical Lutheran congregation in general and of his own congregation in particular. He has observed the people, and has learned their needs; and he has called upon the Lord to supply those needs. The result of this double preparation for his sermons Pastor Kuegele produces before his congregation under the constant surveillance of Christian grace and tact, pastoral wisdom, and rugged common sense. He compels his hearers to enter with him into that

Word of God which he happens to expound; he does not dodge a difficulty, whether in the language or the doctrine of the text; he carefully distinguishes where a text admits of various meanings; his illustrations occur at the proper place and are preferably Scriptural; in not a few instances the words immediately preceding them foreshadow them; he scorns far-fetched explanations; and if there is anything labored about these sermons, it is to the end of becoming plain, quite plain, to his hearers."

Seventy-two texts, twenty-four of them from the Old Testament, are treated in this volume. Each text is designed for use on a particular Sunday of the ecclesiastical year. The choice of these texts and their treatment is in a large measure determined by the pericopal system of the Lutheran Church. The text for the First Sunday in Advent (Ps. 118, 24—29) reiterates the Hosanna of the Gospel in Matthew. The second coming of Christ is treated on the Second Sunday in Advent, no doubt, because the regular Gospel for that Sunday from Luke suggested that theme. The "voice in the wilderness" to which the Gospel for the Third Sunday in Advent refers is treated from the Old Testament original for that Sunday. And so on. Of course, there are departures from the beaten path of pericopal thought, and there are instances in which the connection between the author's leading thought with the dominant idea of the respective pericope is less apparent. But, in general, the book may be said to be a good collateral volume to the pericopal system.

Thirty of the author's texts are proof-texts from our Catechism, or parts of proof-texts. If a comparison of the texts with Dietrich's Catechism were instituted, the percentage would be still greater. This shows that the present volume of "free texts" does not intend to practice that freedom which is hardly distinguishable from caprice. Not startling, fanciful, quaint texts, not the oddities of Scripture, but those texts have attracted the author which express some fundamental truth of Christianity. We have been at some pains testing the sufficiency of this volume as a compend of saving truth, and we find that not a single one of the basic truths of our faith has been passed over. The entire Catechism can be preached from the author's array of free texts. This is a very great merit.

We have in this volume two sermons on the Bible: 2 Tim. 3, 15—17: "The Bible Is Proved God's Own Word: 1. by its origin, 2. by its contents, 3. by its effects;" John 5, 39: "The Scriptures as Testifying of Jesus Christ: 1. Christ is the sun and center of the Bible; 2. we must read to find Christ in it."—The mysteries of the Divine Being are set forth on Trinity Sunday from Ps. 36, 6—9: "God's Wonderful and Good Providence: 1. We are to admire, 2. we

are to trust it."—The person, and the personal aspects, of the God-man are studied, always with an eye to the ends of salvation, from John 5, 26, 27: "The Communication of Attributes in the Person of Christ. 1. What the communication of attributes is; 2. what assurance of salvation it gives."—The God-man in His two states of humiliation and exaltation is portrayed from 2 Cor. 5, 21: "Jesus of Nazareth Judged and Condemned. 1. The justice of the sentence; 2. the object for which it was pronounced;" Rom. 8, 31—34: "Christ's Resurrection the Conclusive Evidence of God's Reconciliation to Man: 1. How it proves that God is reconciled to us; 2. how we are now reconciled to God;" Acts 4, 5—20: "The Certainty of Christ's Resurrection: 1. Some external or historic evidence; 2. the internal evidence contained in the deed itself;" Eph. 4, 7—10: "Christ's Ascension to Heaven: 1. What it signifies; 2. whereto and for what purpose He ascended up."—The official functions of Christ are treated from John 1, 29—36: "The Manifestation of Christ by John the Baptist: 1. He proves the identity of Christ; 2. he teaches what the office of Jesus Christ is;" Jer. 23, 5, 6: "In Jesus Christ Jehovah Is Made Man to be Our Righteousness: 1. He is our Brother and our God; 2. He is made unto us Righteousness;" 1 Tim. 1, 15—17: "The Object of the Incarnation of God's Son: 1. He is come to save sinners; 2. this is a faithful and acceptable saying;" Gal. 2, 20: "Jesus Christ Is the Life of His People: 1. How He is the life of His people; 2. by what He dwells in them;" Hebr. 4, 15, 16: "Jesus Christ a High Priest whose Compassion We can Cheerfully Trust: 1. That He can have compassion, because He was tempted like as we are; 2. that He will have compassion, because it is His office to give grace to help in time of need;" 1 Tim. 2, 5, 6: "Jesus Christ Our Ransom: 1. The necessity of a ransom; 2. what the ransom is; 3. for whom the ransom has been paid;" 1 John 2, 1, 2: "Christ Our Advocate with the Father: 1. What His advocacy is; 2. how comforting it is;" Ezek. 34, 15, 16: "The Good Shepherd Providing for His Flock: 1. What He does for the whole flock in general; 2. how He deals with His own singly."

By far the greater portion of the sermons in this stout volume deal with soteriological subjects. In three sermons (III. Advent, XXIV. and XXVII. p. Trin.) distinctly eschatological themes are treated. Lack of space forbids us to exhibit the strong points of these sections in detail.

Pastor Kuegele's sermons have performed a great service to our Church in a critical period. But their efficiency will continue as long as the Church is engaged in her divine calling of the saving of souls by explaining and applying the Word, which alone saves men.

BIBLE HISTORY. Comprising the Old and the New Testament. Compiled for use of the youth of the English Lutheran Church. Published by American Lutheran Publication Board. Pittsburg, Pa. 161 pages. Price, 35 cts. per copy, postpaid; less in lots.

Eighty Bible stories, 35 from the Old (Creation to Daniel), and 45 from the New Testament (Zacharias to Conversion of Paul), are here offered. In the text of the stories the words of the Bible are retained, and the Bible references are given at the head of each story. The stories are carefully divided into sections, and by the use of italics, as in the first story, the leading matter of a paragraph, or an important saying is made prominent to the eye. Nearly every story is accompanied by one or more illustrations, taken from the works of acknowledged masters. (The nimbus on page 22 should be removed.) This feature gives to the book a lively appearance, and will, no doubt, fascinate the children and incite them to an eager study of the text. The doctrinal or practical facts which each story teaches are summed up at the end, either in the form of a striking Bible text, or, in most cases, by a brief reference to pertinent parts of Luther's Small Catechism. The conclusion is formed by a stanza from some standard hymn.—As a textbook for the beginner's study of Bible History this handy volume possesses great merit. The selections are made with good judgment, both as regards quantity and quality, and the many divisions, indicated, moreover, by lateral headings in bold type, facilitate progress in easy stages, and will prove a boon to feeble learners. The book is a delight to the child's eye and heart, gives point and direction to the teacher's efforts, and greatly lessens his labors of inculcating and explaining the stories.

HOMILETISCHES REALLEXIKON NEBST INDEX RERUM von
E. Eckhardt. Vol. C—F, pp. 467—926; and vol. G,
pp. 927—1458. Blair, Nebr. 1908—09. Price, \$2.40
per vol.

These two volumes of the meritorious undertaking of Rev. Eckhardt, which we have noticed before, carry the work forward to the end of letter G. The last volume contains a digest of the vast material that has accumulated under such titles as "Gerechtigkeit," "Glaube," "Gnadenwahl." Increasing use has convinced us of the great usefulness and serviceableness of this work, and we rejoice to learn that the undertaking is now financially secured, and the remaining volumes (4—6) will appear in rapid succession.

LUTHER ALBUM. A Precursor of the Fourth Centennial Celebration in Memory of the Nailing of the 95 Theses upon the Door of the Castle Church at Wittenberg on October 31, 1517, by Dr. Martin Luther. Illustrated by 24 engravings of Wm. Weimar's celebrated paintings of Luther's life and a new Portrait, Dr. Martin Luther, by *K. Astfalck*.—Submitted by *Martin S. Sommer*. Louis Lange Publishing Co., St. Louis, Mo. 1910. Price, \$1.00.—The same work with German text by *Rev. Augustus Lange*.

The exhaustive titles of these splendid publications of the Lange Press sufficiently describe their contents and scope. The printer and binder have done their best to produce an attractive volume. And the authors, the Revs. Lange and Sommer, have told, each along the same main lines, but each independently of the other, the Life of the Reformer in a manner that combines copious information with lively movement. It is a pleasure to read these volumes. They will be in great demand at the coming Festival of the Reformation and still more at the Centennial seven years hence.

HANDBUECHLEIN ZUR VORBEREITUNG AUF DEN TOD. Von *Martin Moller*. With Preface by *O. Willkomm*. Published by Johannes Herrmann in Zwickau, Saxony. VI and 206 pages. Price, 50 cts.

The author is probably unknown to our circle of readers. To introduce him, we transfer from the appreciative Preface of Rev. Willkomm the following biographical data: Martin Moller, a peasant's son, was born 1547 at Leissnitz, near Wittenberg, studied at the latter place, became precentor at Loewenberg in Silesia, in 1568, pastor at Kesselsdorf, near Loewenberg, in 1572, diaconus at the latter place in the same year, pastor at Sprottau, in 1575, pastor primarius at Goerlitz, in 1600, lost his eyesight in 1605, but continued the active discharge of his pastoral duties until his death on March 2, 1606. He was the author of the well-known "Praxis evangelica," a practical and popular exposition of the pericopal texts for Sundays and festival days.

He endeared himself to his generation, and to all generations of men since, especially by his book on "the holy art of dying." A book

of this kind can never outgrow its usefulness in the Christian Church. The sad subject with which it deals is an ever-present reality with mortal men. And Moller is a most excellent companion to the dying Christian.

The theology which was able to produce this book three hundred years ago would obtain scant recognition in our day among "theologians." It is not scientific. Nor is death, nor hell, nor paradise. But this book exhibits that practical habitude of the mind to understand and to apply to men in their sorest needs the correction and comfort of the divine Word, which only God can bestow and which alone constitutes a person a theologian. Rev. Willkomm has done well to republish this famous book.

LUTHERWORTE UND BEKENNTNISSTELLEN ALS NACHKLANG ZUR
CALVINFEIER. By *M. Willkomm*. Same publisher as
above. 56 pages. Price, M. .30.

The Calvin quadricentennial appears to have been a triumph of the forces of syncretism in the Protestant churches of Germany. Over and against the unionistic tendencies which are rampant in our day, this collection of "Words of Luther" and "Statements of the Confessions" restates the old grounds of division between Lutheranism and Calvinism, and shows that the gulf which yawns between the two oldest Protestant church-bodies cannot be bridged by mere sentiment. The fortunes of the Church, which is the abode of truth and sincerity, are ill served by an attitude of indifference, and by such reckless charity as is usually advocated by the men who clamor for peace at any price, even at the price of sacred principles. This brochure is a very opportune publication. May it open many eyes!

DER EV.-LUTH. HAUSFREUND. By *O. Willkomm*. Same publisher as above. Price, 15 cts.

This Christian almanac for 1911 is distinguished chiefly by a cordially written memoir of the sainted Dr. Walther, the centenary of whose birth occurs October 25th of the coming year.

For want of space we must content ourselves with a brief mention of the following tracts and pamphlets:—

Why Should a Christian Partake of the Lord's Supper Frequently? By Rev. John H. C. Fritz. (Publisher: Rudolph Volkering,

St. Louis. Price, 12 copies for 30 cts.) — The four reasons here given are convincing, and that a tract on this subject has a mission to perform in the Church there can be no doubt.

Geschichte der Ev.-Luth. Stadt- und Kindermission in Illinois, hauptsaechlich in Chicago. Herausgegeben von der Kommission fuer Stadtmision. 1910.— This booklet tells what Chicago Lutherans are doing to reclaim prodigals, and to aid the poor, destitute, and forsaken. The chapter on the Children's Home and the Juvenile Court Home are very affecting.

The Council of Uppsala. By N. Forsander.— This most interesting brochure of Dr. Forsander of Augustana Seminary describes stirring events of three and a half centuries ago, when Lutheranism carried the day against Catholicism, Jesuitism, etc., in the mother-church in Sweden.

Officielt Referat oefver Foerhandlingarna vid Iowa Konferensens af Ev. Luth. Augustana-Synodens Fyrtioandra arsmoete.— Contains business transaetions of the fortieth convention of the Iowa District of the Augustana Synod, and statistics.

Present-Day Lutheranism. By Prof. Frank P. Manhart. Philadelphia, Pa. The Lutheran Publication Society.— In 72 theses the author expatiates on the divided condition of the Lutheran Church in America, the causes for these divisions, as he views them,— and despises them,— and the means to unite or federate the Lutheran forces of America and of the world, if possible, by 1917.

The Evangelical Congregation. A Synodical Address by G. U. Wenner. New York.— This able address contains well-deserved strictures on the departure from the original Lutheran idea of what the congregation and its divine authority and mission is. The Missourians are credited with being the only people "among whom the congregational system has been consistently and well developed."

The Return from the Captivity. A Sermon Preached in Recognition of the Two Hundredth Anniversary of the Palatine Immigration. By George U. Wenner. Lutheran Publication Society, Philadelphia, Pa.— This historical address carries us back to the planting of the Lutheran Church in the State of New York, in the days of Joshua Kocherthal, relates the sad state of the Church in the period which followed the Palatine Immigration, and appreciably distinguishes between the spirit of Lutheran and Reformed teaching.

Supplementary Discoveries Showing Aryo-Semitic Cognition. By Allison Emery Drake. Denver and London. 1910.